




HELEN & MICHAEL
OPPENHEIMER



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

Domesday Studies

VOLUME II.

S U D R I

H A N T E S C I R E



1° West of Greenwich

Domesday Commemoration

1086 A.D.—1886 A.D.

DOMESDAY STUDIES

BEING THE PAPERS READ AT THE MEETINGS OF
THE DOMESDAY COMMEMORATION 1886

WITH A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF DOMESDAY BOOK AND ACCOUNTS
OF THE MSS AND PRINTED BOOKS EXHIBITED AT
THE PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE AND AT
THE BRITISH MUSEUM

EDITED BY

P. EDWARD DOVE

OF LINCOLN'S INN, BARRISTER-AT-LAW

HONORARY SECRETARY OF THE DOMESDAY COMMEMORATION COMMITTEE

THE BIBLIOGRAPHY OF DOMESDAY BOOK

EDITED BY HENRY B. WHEATLEY, F.S.A.

VOLUME II.

Printed by

SPOTTISWOODE & CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE, LONDON

1891

All rights reserved

CONTENTS

OF

VOLUME II.



	PAGE
NOTE ON THE ORDER OF DOMESDAY BOOK. By HYDE CLARKE, V.P.R.Hist.S.	387
THE CHURCH IN DOMESDAY. WITH ESPECIAL REFERENCE TO EPISCOPAL ENDOWMENTS. By JAMES PARKER, M.A.	399
PARISH CHURCHES OMITTED IN THE SURVEY. THE PRESBYTER. By HERBERT J. REID, F.S.A.	433
THE SCOPE OF LOCAL ELUCIDATION OF THE DOMESDAY SURVEY. By FREDERICK E. SAWYER, F.S.A.	447
THE DOMESDAY SURVEY OF SURREY. By H. E. MALDEN, M.A., F.R.Hist.S.	459
ON AN ALLEGED INSTANCE OF THE FALLIBILITY OF DOMESDAY IN REGARD TO 'ANCIENT DEMESNE.' By SIR HENRY BARKLY, K.C.B.	471
THE MATERIALS FOR THE RE-EDITING OF THE DOMES- DAY BOOK. AND SUGGESTIONS FOR THE FORMATION OF A DOMESDAY BOOK SOCIETY. By W. DE G. BIRCH, F.S.A.	485
THE OFFICIAL CUSTODY OF DOMESDAY BOOK. By HUBERT HALL, F.S.A., F.R.Hist.S.	517
AN EARLY REFERENCE TO DOMESDAY. By J. HORACE ROUND, M.A.	539

	PAGE
SUMMARY OF A 'NEW VIEW OF THE GELDABLE UNIT OF ASSESSMENT OF DOMESDAY.' By O. C. PELL . . .	561
DOMESDAY COMMEMORATION 1886. NOTES ON THE MANU- SCRIPTS &C. EXHIBITED AT H.M. PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE . .	621
DOMESDAY COMMEMORATION 1886. NOTES ON THE MANU- SCRIPTS AND PRINTED BOOKS EXHIBITED AT THE BRITISH MUSEUM.	649
DOMESDAY BIBLIOGRAPHY	663
INDEX.	697
<hr/>	
DOMESDAY MAP OF SUSSEX.	<i>Frontispiece</i>

Note on the Order of Domesday Book.

By HYDE CLARKE, V.P.R.Hist.S.

IN the preoccupation of the Conference, the time of which was fully occupied, there was no occasion for the consideration of the order of Domesday, and many other topics.

The order in which the entries are made differs in the counties, and in some respects appears casual, but there are resemblances to be noted.

The King has his place.

The Bishops and Abbots appear together.

The Comes constitutes a class.

At the end small tenants are grouped.

With respect to those regarded as Barons no general principle is at once to be recognised.

Among the Norman Rolls¹ is one headed, 'Hic incipit Registrum Domini Illustrissimi Regis Philippi de Feodis.' It is a registry of the holdings *in capite* in Normandy, without the details of Domesday. It contains a proportionately greater number of names than in Domesday, showing that the landowners were in direct relation with the Duke. It may be inferred that the participants in English lands had been mostly of the status of *tenentes in capite* in Normandy,

¹ Léchaudé d'Anisy, *Magn. Rot. Scaccar. Norman.*, Société des Antiquaires de Caen, 2nd series, vol. lvi. &c. 1840.

and that their relations with the king in England were regulated on that footing.

The first entry is 'Robertus Bertrand¹ tenet Baroniam de Briquebec per servitium quinque militum.'

Then come 'Ric^s de Harcourt,' with the barony of Saint Sauveur ;² 'Ric^s de Vernone,' with barony ; 'Gul^s de Hommeto,' with barony of Hommet, and a number of other single fiefs.

Next come 'Feoda Ricardi de Harcourt,' with his holdings ; 'Feoda Ricardi de Vernone,' with his holdings ; 'Feoda Gulⁱ de Hommeto,' with his holdings ; &c.

Afterwards come a series of headings in this form : 'Feoda de Ballia Rothomagensi,' with the enumeration of a number of small holdings.

Then the large baronies commence, and so with the series of balliages.

Thus the general order of the Registrum of Philip is by balliages, and the general order of Domesday is by shires and counties. The sheriff was taken as the equivalent of the bailiff, and the accountability of each appears to have been placed on the same footing.

The magnates who are barons come first in the Norman balliages ; and the magnates who are Counts come first in the English shires.

Instead of Domesday Book having been modelled on some anterior English formula of Edward the Confessor or his predecessors, as assumed, the appearance is that Domesday may have been arranged on some Norman model. The Norman balliages as divisions existed T.R.E., and so did their administrative system. The English shires were assimilated.

¹ These Bertrands, according to the 'Historical Memoirs of the House of Russell,' by J. H. Wiffen, are the main stock of the latter house, and belong to the family of Rollo.

² The well-known house of Harcourt was of the like descent with the Bertrands.

lated to the balliages, but the conditions did not correspond. The Normans in Normandy took possession of territories which had been administered by the Romans, and provided with men competent to write Latin, and this foreign language was adopted by the Normans as their administrative language. T.R.E. the population of England spoke and wrote English. When the Normans came here, English was foreign to them, and for their administration they continued to use Latin, working by means of continental monks and scribes. This state of affairs favours a foreign origin for Domesday. An antecedent record would have been written in English.

With regard to the order in which the body of *tenentes in capite* are entered, they appear to be casually arranged. The late Earl of Crawford and Balcarres, when engaged in investigations for the genealogy of his own family in the 'Lives of the Lindsays,' conceived he had discovered one element of order in an arrangement of some names according to descent or alliance of their members.

In the case of Radulphus de Limesi a careful examination of his possessions in each shire of Domesday shows me that Lord Crawford is correct in his main proposition. He was a man of singular industry and scholarship, and of that philosophical judgment which gave him the qualities of a true historian. His proposition well deserves to be carefully examined and worked out by the students of Domesday.

In reference to this paper the opportunity occurs of correcting Lord Crawford as to one point in the position of Radulphus de Limesi, 'nepos regis,' and it may apply to other Domesday cases. He supposes on later evidence that Radulphus was a subtenant in Normandy under the Count of Tancarville, but from this Norman roll, the Registrum, it appears that Limesi in the balliage of Rouen was held direct as much as the county of Tancarville. Under the enumeration of the possessions of the Count of Tancarville no

part of Limesi is included, though the church of Limesi appears to have been then divided into moieties as far back as 1131 (p. 615).

When Limesi was included in the county of Tancarville it was under a new administrative arrangement, whereby the lordships were grouped into baronies, and the baronies were grouped into counties. In this way Limesi came to be included in the county of Tancarville.

There is no proof that at any time Limesi rendered homage to Tancarville, or was a true fief of it, but only an administrative member in the later ages. Thus in '*Description Historique et Géographique de la Haute Normandie*,' Paris, 1740, vol. ii., which is an ecclesiastical register, it is stated at pp. 614 and 615 that the bourg of Limesi is in the Government of Normandy, Parliament &c. of Rouen, Balliage of Rouen.

At p. 616 it also says that Limesi was a fief de Haubert, formerly called the king's fief, and having its manoir at Brunville. It was supposed to be the first moiety, but its rights in the church were contested by the Lord of Frontebose.

The second fief was that of Frontebose, held of the barony of Moreville, or Montville, a member dependent of the county of Tancarville.

Thus it is clear that only half of the original fief of Limesi was ever included in the county of Tancarville, which appears to have had superiority in 1297 (p. 616), but perhaps only in relation to the Church.

Lord Crawford stated that not only were Limesi and Toeny lands found in the same shire and registered in Domesday together, but that in some places lands were intermixed.

The value of Lord Crawford's doctrine, as supported by historical facts largely accumulated by him, shows that such

examination as in the case of the Limesi and Toeny, efficiently illustrates the motives of Domesday. It does more, it affords criteria for the decision of the obscure questions of political and social position in the determination of historical points, as well as their bearing on the genealogies of the individual tenants and subtenants.

In the way in which Lord Crawford laboriously worked out his portion of the subject, he showed what is of more importance even than the connections of the *tenentes in capite*, the relations to them and each other of the subtenants. The material so provided increases the area of Domesday studies largely, for beyond the shires therein enumerated materials are found for Scotch history.

The subtenants in England and in Scotland who in time replaced the great Norman barons and provided a new aristocracy for the island are to be defined by Lord Crawford's methods.

In the case of the Toeni and Limesi, he showed that they brought with them as neighbours in England their neighbours in Normandy. By these the arms of the chiefs were assumed, and in Normandy, in England, and in Scotland, these names are found in common as witnesses of charters. When the house of Limesi was established in Scotland, the same incidents and the same connections are observable. As these conditions extend to other families, so are the materials enlarged for dealing with an obscure epoch of the history of Scotland.

It may be said that this applies also to that most obscure part of the history of England, the constitution of the English people. How far this was purely Norman or purely English in the higher or middle classes is debatable, as also how far the main body of the population partakes of Norman descent.

A careful perusal of Domesday shows that the Norman immigration was limited, as, indeed, it must have been greatly limited by circumstances. The Normans, largely of Germanic

descent, were intermingled with Germanic allies from the north coasts of France and the Low Countries. Some of the Norman barons coopted for Normandy. Many of their followers returned, as they could not practically settle here. In fact, the Normans were never recruited, and in the Danelage they must have been absorbed by the Danish element.

Thus the main population of England, after Domesday, remained as English. With these the Norman cadets had to intermarry. Some intermarried with Anglo-Norman heiresses, but the English alliances preponderated. The English thanes fell in the social scale, and their descendants became subtenants: but what brought them relief was their share in the Norman wars in Wales, Scotland, Ireland, France, and the Crusades. In this way warlike relations restored the social position of the thanes and their children.

The effective influence of the Normans on the population of England was the displacement of the English thanes and the Norman barons, and their substitution by a new race of Anglo-Norman men and of English women. In time some subtenants became yeomen, the offspring of these farmers, and so in descent to labourers, so that the whole population has been brought to unity, and Norman names may be found distributed among the peasantry.

It is by the various incidents of association in Domesday and otherwise that Lord Crawford is enabled to explain the relation between Radulphus de Limesi, as a Toeny, with Robertus de Stadfold, 'nepos domini,' whom he defines also as a Toeny in support of Dugdale (Stadfold).

This also illustrates the connection of the house with that of Rollo.

In the obscure history of Limesi, one point in Domesday left unexplained is the possession of half the barony of Strigul by Radulphus. Clutterbuck ('Hertfordshire,' vol. ii. p. 505) states that Ralph de Limesi held half by having married a

sister of Roger Fitzosberne, Earl of Hereford, and that William de Ow married the other sister. Certain it is that in Domesday Radulphus is recorded under Gloucestershire as holding half Strigul.

My own suggestion is founded on the circumstance that the Strigul moiety was not conveyed with his other possessions to the descendants of Radulphus. There is this further to be noticed, that lands of the Princess Christina, in Warwickshire, are recorded as held by her in Domesday, but after 1086 are found to be in possession of Radulphus and to have passed to his heirs. Indeed, it was to Ulverley, as stated, one of her estates, that he transferred the head of his barony, which is a post-Domesday transaction, say 1090.

Strigul disappears, and the lands of Christina disappear, and a possible solution is that the king, a patron of William Fitzosberne and his house, favoured that line by giving to Radulphus the possessions of the Princess, for half Strigul, in cession to William de Ow.

It is to be observed that William de Ow and Radulphus both held lands in Herts, Somerset, and Devon.

In the early settlement of Hertfordshire also de Limesi had the first seat of his barony at Pirton, and that established by Roger de Toden, or Poeni, at Flamstead remained the head of the latter barony.

Each of these Barons had a small share in Hertfordshire, but Roger de Toden held nineteen lordships in Norfolk. Radulphus was well endowed there and in Suffolk.

The fact of the relationship of the Toeny or Limesi group in Domesday discovered by Lord Crawford does not necessarily decide the whole question of association.

The way in which lands in a shire are divided up is capricious to a certain extent, and the case of Radulphus de Limesi will serve to show this. Although a person of the highest class, and endowed with more than forty lordships in many

southern shires, his whole holding was small in comparison with that of others, and in some instances his portion in a county was very small. Thus, large as his barony has been considered, it is nothing to that of his nephew Robert (de Toeny) de Stadford or Stafford, who held 150 manors, and of course bears no comparison with the possessions of the uterine brothers of the king, naturally most largely provided for.

The whole holding of Radulphus de Limesi is evidently the accumulation of successive grants, as in the case of his associates, and other *tenentes* registered. His early grants must have been in Hertfordshire, together with those of Rayner de Limesi, the father of Bishop Robertus de Limesi of Chester or Lichfield and Coventry. In Hertfordshire Radulphus founded the Priory of Hertford as a cell of St. Albans, but his castle in Hertfordshire is found to be at Pirton, which appears to have been a later possession than Amwell in the south. The Hertfordshire grants may have been in two lots.

The opportunity is afforded by the example of Radulphus de Limesi to show what the castles of the *tenentes* were. On obtaining greater possessions northwards, Radulphus, who had one centre for his East Anglian manors at Oxburgh, set up his main seat at Ulverley or Wolverley near Birmingham in Warwickshire, which became afterwards the head of his barony, and he is hence as stated denominated Baron of Ulverley.

Neither at Pirton nor at Ulverley are there any remains of what is understood as a Norman castle, but at each place is a round mound, and this must have been so originally at Oxburgh, which now represents the site of the castle. That at Ulverley is called Dood Hill.

These castles must therefore have been ramparts of earth, perhaps with a ditch. It would have been difficult for the newly arrived *tenentes* to erect everywhere stone

castles, an idea founded on the stone castles built by the king and earls. Quarrymen and masons could not have been found, and they would have had to be paid in money wages. Earthworks could be set up with the labour and tools of the local inhabitants. In such an earthwork the cattle would be secure against raids. The house and out-houses would be of wood. Such earthworks would be ample to enable a tenant to hold out against any common attacks, and against those of more danger he would take refuge in the castle of the burgh. It is possible that Amwell was first obtained by Radulphus as being under the shelter of Hertford Castle, and that Pirton was his next stage. No licence appears to have been necessary for the earthen strongholds.

One conclusion to be drawn is that the Normans soon became on good terms with their tenants. The lord was greatly dependent on his tenants, and his resident representative would have a mutual interest in money matters, and would become Englished.

On the barony of Ulverley passing to co-heiresses the castles of Maxstoke and Oxburgh were built in stone and were the work of that generation. By such time the country had become more settled, and resources were available for stone castles as well as stone churches.

Instead of simple consanguinity constituting the sole tie between a group of sharers, it is possible there were other causes of association. Indeed if consanguinity were the only basis, then the apportionment of the members of a family should be regulated by it.

The cause of the formation of groups and their interdistribution is to be attributed to the constitution of a common expedition for the invasion of England. As there were individual Normans who contributed so many ships, so must others of smaller means have associated themselves. Sharing in the equipment of a ship was a tradition of the Norsemen,

and kept in full vigour in Normandy in their later expeditions to Spain, Sicily, &c.

In fact the inland resident would be dependent on the owner of a ship. The ships and fishing barques would be secured by the residents on the coast, and they could bring in inland sharers to supply men, arms, and provisions. Those of a family would be among the first to become partners, and the prospective profits of the venture would be apportioned. Radulphus de Limesi for instance held a small inland lordship in the Roumois. Thus his share would be inferior to that of some other partners.

With him, however, were associated those neighbours designated by Lord Crawford, and whom he would represent as a chief.

After the invasion the company would still keep together. They received successive allotments, and one member must have been left near the person of the king, and who enjoyed his favour, to look out for portions of lands falling into the king's power. Such representative would have his separate reward, and his share would be enlarged.

The manors so acquired were scattered, and it was for the interest and safety of the lords to keep together for management and protection. There are lands of Radulphus de Limesi in Devonshire and Somerset so inconsiderable that it is difficult to conceive what profit they could have given.

An evidence of the breaking up of the Norman grants is shown by the early disposal of some of the outlying Limesi lands. In such cases subinfeudation to a subtenant became a common process.

After all had been got that was to be got by pressing claims on the king, about 1086, before or after, the tie between each group of adventurers would be dissolved, and their several elements would be no longer in cohesion. Both conditions have to be considered in describing the history of the

Norman settlement. Those who were not related in a shire would stand apart, and those related having no longer anything to seek in common would be left under ordinary influences.

With regard to the connection of the Norman barons with Normandy general features are known. In the example of the Limesi there was only a small lordship in Normandy, not to be weighed against the barony of Ulverley. Many of the Limesi settled in England (see 'Lives of the Lindsays' for some). The lordship of Limesi was not held by the direct line of Radulphus, as the descent of his barony of Ulverley in Dugdale and other authorities shows. Who succeeded to the lordship of Limesi is not clear, but either by division or otherwise the name of Limesi dropped out in Normandy at length.

To these remarks may be appended a note as to the use of acre and virgate in Normandy. In the charter of foundation of Ardena in the 'Gallia Christiana,' vol. ii., Instrument 79, A.D. 1138, is recited 'unam acram,' and there is also to be found a 'virgata.'

In Instrument 89, between 1181 and 1190, is to be found enumerated 'duas acras.'

The Church in Domesday.

WITH ESPECIAL REFERENCE TO EPISCOPAL ENDOWMENTS.

By JAMES PARKER, M.A.

NO ONE can well turn over the leaves of the Domesday Survey without being struck by the vast quantity of land, which in one way or another was held by the Church.

On examination it will be seen that the great bulk consists of the endowments of the ancient English Church, which the Conqueror respected. Some of this is represented by manors or portions of manors under the control of the two Archbishops and the Bishops of the several dioceses, and in most cases the names of the manors are entered beneath the names of the Bishops as *Tenentes in Capite*. A still larger proportion is represented by manors belonging to the several Monasteries, such being entered beneath the names of these bodies also as *Tenentes in Capite*.

To the former, which may be said to represent mainly the endowment of the Cathedral establishments of England, I reckon over nine hundred manors or portions of manors. To the latter, which may be said to represent all other Ecclesiastical Communities, I reckon somewhat over seventeen hundred.¹

¹ I have thought it best to take the 'manor' as the basis of comparison between one Bishopric and another, in respect of its wealth and importance in preference to the 'hide' or any special measure. At the same time, although as

Besides this, there are the endowments of the numerous manorial churches and priests, now parish churches and parish priests, of which no estimate can be made ; for their value is very rarely separated from the total value of the manor, and the special land of which the endowment consists is generally included in the general description of the manor to which it belongs, or in which it lies. Besides which, many churches then existing are from one reason or another without any mention whatever.

Nor is this quite all. If the Church as a whole is taken into account, there must be added the manors granted to the four Bishops of Norman dioceses (which, including Bishop Odo's manors, come to a total nearly as high as that of the English Bishoprics), as well as a fair sprinkling granted to monasteries and ecclesiastical foundations situated in Normandy.

So far as the English Bishoprics and the English monastic foundations are concerned, a very large proportion of the manors, as I propose to show, had already been appropriated to the endowment in King Edward's time, and it must be remembered that the Record does not profess to go back beyond that date. In some few cases additional endowments seem to have been added for various reasons.

Some of these reasons no doubt were political, and had nothing to do with honour done to the Church. And if we take into consideration the endowments of the Norman

a rule the manor is very clearly defined in Domesday, it is not always so. In the north, too, the Berewics and Sokes are sometimes scarcely to be distinguished from the manors, and, as regards extent of land, might often well be reckoned as such. It will be seen that in one or two cases I have explained in the note the system of computation adopted. But I would say generally that the figures here given must not be taken to imply that the whole number of manors given were subject to the Bishop. In several cases he had only certain portions of them ; and, on the other hand, in a few cases divisions of land are counted which are not strictly manors. For the purpose of comparison, however, the calculation will be found, it is hoped, to be fairly accurate.

Bishops, we are forced to see in them almost entirely considerations of policy, William of Normandy using them as a means for securing and strengthening his power in the country. It will be well, perhaps, to deal with the latter first of all, since they stand on a different footing from the English dioceses, and other considerations than those connected only with the Church come in.

Taking the full total of the number of manors in the hands of the four Bishops presiding over DIOCESES in NORMANDY, I reckon according to my own counting some 800. But it must be remembered that the great bulk of them are entered beneath the name of Odo, King William's half-brother, the celebrated Bishop of BAYEUX. And, further, it must be remembered that a very large number came to him as Earl of Kent, through his succession to Godwin's property, and these cannot be reckoned as in any way connected with the Church. Odo in fact appears in a double character, and perhaps therefore it would be, to begin with, only right to deduct a very large number of the manors, especially amongst those in Kent, which appear under his name in the Domesday record. It is difficult to say how many he received *quâ* Earl of Kent and as successor to Godwin, since in some cases the tenure T.R.E. is given obscurely in the Survey, and in others not at all.

Still, if we make allowance for this, out of some 200 manors in Kent, and some 300 held by him distributed through seventeen different counties ranging from Dorset and Somerset on the west, Worcester, Nottingham, and Northampton on the north, and Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex on the east, as well as through nearly all the counties included within that area, we have still remaining a tenure which represents an enormous power for the Bishop of a foreign diocese to wield : and this is made clear when it is remembered that the total of the manors

in the king's hands throughout the country was only just over 1,400. In a large number of the cases, where it is given, the owner of Odo's lands T.R.E. appears as a free man, but his holding frequently is described as 'de rege.' Taken as a whole, the lands appear to have been bestowed upon him largely from crown property, partly from property belonging to the Earldom of Kent, and partly from property the holders of which had borne arms against the king, and so had been confiscated.

Next, the Norman Bishop of COUTANCES, Geoffrey of Mowbray, whose name appears in the history of the Conquest as playing a prominent part in aiding William during the battle near Hastings, is returned in Domesday as holding some 260 manors distributed through twelve counties, most of them in the south. In Devonshire he seems to have been mostly favoured, nearly 100 manors falling to his lot, and next in Somersetshire, where nearly seventy manors seem to have fallen beneath his control. In Dorset two; in Wilts seven; in Gloucestershire nine; in Berkshire only one. Going northward he had in Buckinghamshire twenty given to him, and in Northants about forty. In Leicester, Warwick, and Huntingdon he had only one in each county.

But in the cases of these two Norman Bishops it is obvious that political considerations were paramount. Odo and Geoffrey were men whom the Conqueror thought he could trust. It was accidental their holding the Bishoprics of Bayeux and Coutances, or rather these important positions had already been conferred upon them on grounds of policy in their own country by Duke William, and the same confidence was placed in them in another land by King William.

The distribution of the manors as shown in Domesday touches the keynote of the policy. Kent with the 200, and the adjoining county of Surrey with 32 more, were practically in the hands of his brother Odo, so as to keep open the way

from Normandy to the Metropolis. In these parts Geoffrey of Coutances had no manors whatever. In the west the influence of the Bishop of Coutances was rendered paramount by 90 manors in Devonshire and 70 in Somerset. In these counties, except in the solitary manor of Combe in Somerset, which he may well have acquired by purchase or by some accidental circumstance, Odo of Bayeux had no influence whatever ; hence, if one failed him, the Conqueror could fall back upon the other as regards a large extent of seaboard of the country accessible from Normandy. In the other counties included within the area, marked out by their joint possessions, in six counties Odo alone had manors, in five Geoffrey alone had manors, and in six they each had manors. All this, which Domesday brings out so clearly, betokens a definite policy based upon state reasons, and not out of respect or honour done to the Church.

Of course, too, the same policy of distributing throughout the country men on whom the Conqueror could rely, is shown by the appointment and the distribution of the manors of his lay nobles, but with that I have not in this paper to deal. What, however, I wish here to point out is that the manors above referred to were probably granted personally to the men themselves, not to their official position as Bishops of those sees.

The Bishops of two smaller Norman dioceses were also represented by manors held by them in this country, and possibly these also may have been given for political reasons ; perhaps, however, only out of friendship. The Bishop of LISIEUX seems to have had sixteen manors allotted to him, distributed through six counties. In Oxfordshire and Dorsetshire four each, in Gloucestershire three, in Wilts and Bucks two each, and in Hertfordshire one, and in Herefordshire one. I do not think it at all probable that any of the manors were granted to Hugh of Eu, who was Bishop of Lisieux at the

time of the Conquest, and who died in 1077, and that they passed on to his successor in that see, but I think that they represent a personal grant to Gilbert Maminot, who had combined the double office of physician and chaplain to the Conqueror before he was appointed to the Bishopric. But the Survey does not distinctly say this.

The other Norman prelate holding land in England at the time of the Survey was the Bishop of EVREUX, and in this case there is no question, as the Survey gives his name, Gilbert. He was not consecrated till 1070. However, two manors in Suffolk appear to be all which were granted to him.

I have not observed that any lands were granted to Maurice, Archbishop of Rouen, nor yet to his successor John of Avranches, who succeeded to the Archbishopric in 1069, nor to William Bonne-Ame, who succeeded the latter in 1079. It is perhaps somewhat strange that the Archbishopric should not be represented in the newly acquired country. Perhaps it was that William did not put much faith in Maurice.

Neither have I observed that the Bishopric of Avranches is represented either by John of Bayeux, or by Michael, who succeeded him in the Bishopric in 1079. Nor yet that the remaining diocese of Seez was represented here either by the 'learned, wise, and witty' Ivo of Belesme, as Orderic Vital calls him, or by Robert of Ry who succeeded about A.D. 1070 to that Bishopric. Hence the seven dioceses into which the great province of Normandy was divided were very imperfectly represented in England, and this fact points also to the *men* being selected rather than the Bishops.

Apart, however, from the advantage of having the personal influence of the Bishops whom he favoured, it was undoubtedly an important element in William's policy to weld as far as possible the Church of the two countries together, know-

ing that this would aid more than anything else in welding together the State. It was Archbishop Theodore's policy of uniting in one common bond the several dioceses of England, and so making one Church, which four hundred years previously had not only led the way, but had aided materially in the work of federation, which in time welded the several provinces into which England was at his time divided, into one country and one state.

We now come to the Bishops of the ENGLISH DIOCESES, and here considerations of a different kind come in. As a preliminary observation I would say that the lands belonging to the Bishops, as well as those appropriated to certain ecclesiastical purposes connected with the See, were for by far the most part the lands with which the Bishopric had been endowed from time to time. Some of the endowments had been lost, but such as remained in the time of Edward the Confessor were in no case confiscated, or their title even called in question. As the historian of the Norman Conquest puts it, 'In the case of Ecclesiastical property, the will and seal of Eadward was as good as William's.'

The lands of the English Archbishop Stigand, so far as they belonged to the Archbishopric, passed as a matter of routine to the Norman Lanfranc simply because Lanfranc succeeded to the Archbishopric of CANTERBURY. Still, in the confusion of the time, and the difficulties of administering justice and distinguishing true records from false, some of the property may have been lost to a few of the dioceses, just as it was lost to several of the monasteries and other religious foundations, but it was not of William's set purpose that such should be the case.

Lanfranc, who had been called from his abbacy of St. Stephen at Caen to succeed to the Archbishopric of Canterbury on the deposition of Stigand in 1070, is returned as

holding land in above a hundred manors,¹ of which some sixty are in Kent, the remainder being distributed through seven counties; and it is not without importance to observe that, in the Exchequer Domesday, in the eight counties in which the manors lie, viz. Kent, Sussex, Essex, Surrey, Middlesex, Hertford, Bucks, and Oxon, the lands of the Archbishop of Canterbury are always entered after the king's in every case, and marked as Number II. in the list which is given at the beginning of each county, showing the status of the Archbishop of Canterbury in relation to the other nobles of the kingdom.

In the Suffolk Domesday, however, the four manors are entered, not as under the Archbishopric of Canterbury, but for some reason under 'Lanfrancus Archiepiscopus,' and so appear towards the end of the list amongst the minor tenants.

It will be at once observed that, while under most of the manors held by laymen the name of some English Thane, with the words 'tenuit tempore Regis Edwardi,' is as a rule given, throughout nearly all the entries of the Archbishop's lands this formula is absent. The T.R.E. occurs, but only as regards the change of value, not as regards the change of tenure. If any incidents are mentioned they only bring out the fact of continued tenure more forcibly. Almost the first entry with respect to the Archbishop's lands, i.e. on folio 3 of the Survey, illustrates this. It runs :

Sandwich lies in its own hundred. The Archbishop holds this borough, and it is appropriated to the cost of the monks' clothes, and renders similar service to the king as Dover does. And this the men

¹ Of these, twenty-four are entered under the heading of 'Terra Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis'; 17 under 'Terra militum ejus'; and the remainder under 'Terra Monachorum archiepiscopi.' But in the last case the text always runs 'Ipse Archiepiscopus tenet,' and the knights all hold 'de Archiepiscopo.' I have therefore counted the whole under the archiepiscopal manors. In the Essex Domesday, however, the lands are entered under 'Terra Sanctæ Trinitatis,' and they seem to be all 'ad victum monachorum.'

of that borough testify, namely, that King Edward gave it to the church of the Holy Trinity.¹

This does not necessarily mean that it was then first of all given, but the fact that it was confirmed by Edward simply affords a sufficient *title* for Lanfranc to hold it, and indeed is the title by which he did hold it.

In the first entry in the Sussex Manors, again, we find that

Archbishop Lanfranc holds the manor of Mallinges. In the time of King Edward it was assessed at 80 hides, but now the Archbishop only has 75 hides because the Earl of Mortain has 5 hides without the hundred.²

We are not concerned here with the question of the variation of the assessment by 5 hides: the only point is that Archbishop Lanfranc holds them, because they were—as Domesday duly records—held by the English Archbishop in the time of King Edward.

In the case of the solitary manor of Newton, held by the Archbishop in Oxfordshire, the clerk to the Commissioners has thought it well to insert 'It was and is of the Church' ('De ecclesia fuit et est')³; but such an entry as regards the Archbishop's lands is not common, the fact being always taken for granted.

Turning to YORK, we find that Thomas was called from his canonry of Bayeux to the Archbishopric after the death of Ealdred, the last English Archbishop, and this took place towards the end of 1069. He is represented in fewer counties than Lanfranc, but with a larger number of manors, in which he held land. His name appears in six counties only, but with

¹ Domesday, folio 3, col. 1. In the summary of 'Donationes Maneriorum,' printed by Dugdale from a Cottonian MS., the gift first appears under A.D. 979—'Ethelredus Rex dedit ecclesiæ in Dorobernia *Sandwich* ad vestitum monachorum.'

² Dom. folio 16, col. 1. It may be noted that in Gervase's *Chronicle of Canterbury* under the year 838, Mallinges is recorded as being then given to Christ Church, Canterbury.

³ Domesday, folio 155, col. 1.

130 manors, and of these manors 77 were in the county of York itself. Still, as the quantity of land held in several seems to have been extremely small, the total would not, perhaps, be greater than that held by Canterbury.¹ Curiously enough, some are in southern counties; i.e. in Gloucestershire he holds thirteen manors, and in Hampshire one. In the latter case the words ‘antecessor ejus similiter tenuit de Rege’ are added, and imply that the single manor of Mottisfont in Hampshire had already belonged to the Archbishop of York.² In the case of Gloucestershire, we learn in the Survey from whom the thirteen manors passed; and the circumstances are somewhat singular. Two only of the number are entered as having been held by Archbishop Ealdred, the preceding Archbishop of York, who had died in 1069. Five had been held by Stigand, the Archbishop of Canterbury; St. Peter’s, Gloucester, had held two; St. Oswald’s had held two; and three apparently belonged to laymen, unless the name Gundulph refers to the Bishop of Rochester. It is possible that the Archbishop had acquired these latter personally on his own account from some influence he had through friends in the neighbourhood, or by purchase, or through the special friendship of William; still, the fact that he should have so many manors, and derived from so many different sources, in a county so far distant from his own diocese, and indeed Province, rather points to the conclusion that William had some definite design in giving him influence in the south, and not leaving his interests as well as influence to be confined wholly to the north.

That the Archbishop of York should hold land in nine manors in Nottingham and five in Leicester and twenty-five

¹ Several of the places enumerated are perhaps only ‘Berewics,’ but twenty-three which are distinctly so called have been omitted from the enumeration.

² A Charter of King William [? Rufus] granted *ante* 1096 recites, ‘Notum vobis facio quod ego reddidi Thomæ Eborum Archiepiscopo unam hidam terræ quæ pertinet ecclesiæ de Motesfunda, sicuti melius habuit Aldredus Archiepiscopus tempore Regis Eadwardi.’ *Ex Registro penes Dec. et Cap. Ebor.*

in Lincoln is less surprising ; for though they are distinctly in the Southern Province, as afterwards settled, it must be remembered that there was some question as to the extent of the relative jurisdiction of the two Archbishops, as well as to the supremacy of one over the other.

In Yorkshire the estates seem to have belonged to the Archbishopric, as the clerk often inserts the words '*Hoc manerium fuit et est Archiepiscopi Eboracensis*,' and incidentally, in denoting the change of valuation, we find such statements as, 'Eldred the Archbishop held this as one manor, now under Thomas ; the Canons of St. Peter,' &c. His manors in Leicestershire and Nottinghamshire give no names of tenants 'tempore Regis Edwardi,' and we may presume by their absence that the manors previously belonged to the Archbishopric, as in the case of the entries under Canterbury.

In respect of Lincolnshire, however, there would appear to have been some reason for Archbishop Thomas to have had manors assigned to him which had not previously belonged to the see. The words to some three or four of the manors are '*Habuit Elmer*,' '*habuit Alwin*,' '*habuit Turchil*,' &c. ; names which could scarcely refer to the under-tenants. Some few other names occur also as holding single manors, but throughout the twenty-five manors there is no evidence that any previously belonged to the Archbishopric of York, or indeed to any ecclesiastical person or body ; and it would appear that, like the manors in Hampshire, they had been conferred on the Archbishop for some special reason or that he had obtained them through purchase.

All the thirteen Bishops of English dioceses are entered in Domesday as holding manors quâ *Tenentes in Capite*. Traversing the country from the north, southward, the dioceses were—Durham ; Chester, Worcester, and Hereford ; Lincoln and Thetford ; Exeter and Wells ; Salisbury, Winchester, and Chichester ; Rochester and London. These with the

two Archbishoprics made up the fifteen dioceses into which England at the time of the Survey was divided.

They held manors in different proportion. Two only held over one hundred manors at the time of the Survey, namely, Lincoln and Thetford (the predecessor of Norwich). Worcester had just under the hundred. London and Chester follow with about seventy-five. Four dioceses had about fifty manors each, namely, Hereford, Durham (and this, of course, only so far as recorded), Winchester, and Exeter. Salisbury, Rochester, and Wells held each about twenty manors, while at the bottom of the list stands Chichester with ten. For the most part the lands lie in or near to the diocese to which they belonged, but still there are some anomalies, as will be seen.

Beginning with LINCOLN ; of the hundred manors and more in which the Bishop held lands, about thirty¹ are in the county of Lincoln. So far as has been observed, they seem throughout to be the lands which had belonged to various lay tenants T.R.E., but conferred on Remigius, in all probability, as endowments of the new see. The same applies to the fourteen manors in Nottinghamshire and the same number in Leicestershire, and also to most of the remaining forty manors distributed through the counties of Northamptonshire, Bedfordshire, Huntingdonshire, Cambridgeshire, Oxon, and Bucks.²

It must be remembered, however, that in speaking of the see of Lincoln several historical circumstances have to be taken into account. It was not a see founded like Canterbury or Rochester, nor did it grow simply like Winchester. It was in one sense a new see, appearing first of all in the pages of Domesday, in another sense a restoration of an old one, and an amalgamation with other sees. As a new see it is worthy

¹ Several of these manors have large Sokes and Berewics. They may well be reckoned as equivalent to forty manors.

² To the manor of Histon in Cambridgeshire there is this note : ' Hoc manerium est unum de duodecim maneriis dominicis Episcopatus Lincolnensis.'

of remark that throughout the Survey Remigius is styled always '*Episcopus Lincolnensis*,' yet so far as has been observed no document exists in which he styles himself so. The removal of the see from Dorchester was, no doubt, decided upon soon after 1070. Indeed, a charter professes to have been preserved by *inspeximus*, though perhaps it may be said to be somewhat suspicious, in which King William says he transfers the see by the consent of Pope Alexander, and this Pope died in 1073. But Remigius had not completed his new Cathedral at Lincoln till just before his own death, which did not take place till 1092. There is, however, under the account of the city of Lincoln in the Domesday Survey, an entry relating to the Church of St. Mary of Lincoln, and under this the Commissioners' clerk has thought it well to insert the words '*in qua nunc est episcopatus*.' So that the change may be said to have been authoritatively recognised by the Commissioners in 1086, and this perhaps is of greater interest since Bishop Remigius was one of the four Commissioners of the Survey concerning that part of the country, I believe, which included Lincoln.

But the Dorchester diocese was already joined to or rather had incorporated Leicester, and had absorbed within it seemingly the still more ancient diocese of Lindsey. Hence if the list of manors could be examined in connection with a sufficient number of præ-Norman Charters we should possibly find traces of the earlier endowments of three several dioceses, though the bulk appears to be those obtained by Remigius himself.

And here, as the Domesday Survey so definitely records the transfer of the seat of the Bishopric, that is, of the 'Bishop's Stool,' to Lincoln, it is perhaps the place to refer to that point in William's policy which was exhibited so directly and clearly at the council held in London in 1075, namely, the removal of the episcopal residences to the chief towns.

This was equivalent to making the chief towns the centres of the several dioceses. Already, from what his experience in the west had shown to be needed, the seat of the Devonshire diocese at Crediton had been removed to the walled town of Exeter, and quite early in the century the ancient see of Cornwall had been united to it, so that now, since 1073 or thereabouts, the episcopal sway over the whole of Devon and Cornwall could be wielded at Exeter. At this council, therefore, held two years later, the see of Sherborne, to which the ancient see of Ramsbury had been united, was removed to the strong British fortress known as Old Sarum, then occupied by a flourishing town overlooked by a strong castle on its summit; there to remain till 1220, when the seat was again removed to the level ground on which the present famous Cathedral of Salisbury was then in course of erection.

The old seat at Selsea—on the island, as the name implies—was at the same council ordered to be removed to the better position of Chichester. And Lichfield also, then of no account, was removed, temporarily it seems, to St. John's, Chester, but again removed shortly afterwards by Robert of Limesy to Coventry, from which in after years the seat was again removed, and restored to the old site of all, associated as this was with the venerable name of St. Chad.

As a consequence too of the acts of this council, very shortly afterwards Herfast removed the seat of the East Anglian diocese from Elmham to Thetford, where we find it at the time of the Survey; to be again removed shortly after to Norwich: and before the close of the century, John of Tours had removed the seat of the Somersetshire diocese from Wells (as it appears in the Survey) to the ancient Roman city of Bath; but this again in time, like Lichfield, was restored to its pristine site.

Although then it was not directly ordered by this council that the see of Dorchester should be removed to Lincoln, the

change must have been decided upon and the removal must have already been going on, though Remigius probably delayed the transfer of his chapter till his new Cathedral was completed, and meanwhile did not himself adopt the new title, though others gave it to him. Lincoln perhaps was the most important of the removals, and one involving the longest distance; for while the see of Dorchester, representing the greater part of the old Mercian province, was perhaps the largest in the kingdom, the seat was removed from the very southern extremity to the very northern. The flat lands on the north bank of the Thames valley at Dorchester, about fifteen miles below Oxford, may perhaps have been thought to be not so suitable for the seat of the Bishop as the steep hill of Lincoln crowned with the remains of the old Roman occupation, but there must have been further considerations which decided the Conqueror on so sweeping a change.

Other towns might have been found further south, and still very suitable for a Bishop's seat, but what probably weighed most with the Conqueror was his having a man like Remigius, on whom he could depend to exert his influence in the north; to put down rebellion if need be, and gradually to unite closer the interest of Normandy with England in those parts. The story of the bribe of Remigius to the Conqueror to give him the Bishopric probably has its origin in the circumstance that Remigius, just as many other wealthy persons did, subscribed a ship to the fleet which set out from St. Valery on the eve of the Conquest; but it was made to assume its more developed form by some one probably who had suffered from the stern rule of the Bishop. William, however, depend on it, was too astute to trust a man with so important a position who had obtained the appointment by a bribe.

The removal then of Dorchester to Lincoln referred to in Domesday must be attributed to the policy which guided the

Council of 1075; and this policy explains how it is that in the Survey we find a different list of Bishoprics forming the Province of Canterbury from that which we should have found if the Survey had been taken a few years earlier.

And now to speak of some of the other dioceses.

The hundred manors of the see of THETFORD, which had only just been removed from Elmham, were confined to the two counties of Norfolk and Suffolk. The *Tenens in Capite* appears under the name of William, Bishop, in both the counties, not Herfast who was consecrated to Elmham in 1075. This shows that these counties at least were not surveyed till after the commencement of 1086, for in that year only Bishop William of Beaufeu was consecrated. I do not think there are means of ascertaining the exact month when the consecration of William took place; otherwise this might limit more closely the date of the compilation of the Domesday of these parts.

In the first entry in the Norfolk Domesday the title runs, '*Terra Episcopi Tedfordensis. Ad episcopatum pertinens*'; so that the manors belonged to the see, and all passed at once to William on his entering upon the Bishopric; the clerk, however, frequently inserts '*tenuit Ailmarus*.'¹ Ethelmar had been Bishop of Elmham T.R.E. and up to 1070, when he was deposed and Herfast succeeded, during whose tenure the see was removed.

¹ In some few cases the Norfolk Domesday adds notes how the property was acquired. The following are characteristic instances:—

'In Gunetune quam emit Almarus T.R.E. ad episcopatum tenuit die qua fuit mortuus. . . .

In Bigetune tenuit episcopus Almarus per emptionem T.R.E. de Comite Algaro.

In Blafelde tenuit Almarus . . . Hoc manerium accepit Almarus cum uxore sua antequam esset episcopus et postea tenuit in episcopatum. Modo tenet Willelmus episcopus.

Hemeslei tenuit Algarus comes T.R.E. et Alwius emit. Stigandus abstulit et dedit Almaro fratri suo; sed hundredus nescit quomodo ex illo fuit in episcopatum in dominio.

The Bishopric of WORCESTER was presided over by the English Bishop, the celebrated Wulfstan, who had been consecrated in 1062, and was allowed still to retain his see. He did not die till 1095. There are nearly eighty manors in Worcester belonging to this church, but they are entered under the title of '*Terra ecclesiæ de Wirecestre*'; the eight manors in Gloucestershire the same; but in the body of the entry it frequently runs '*Tenet Episcopus*,' and the lands in Warwickshire are all entered under the title of '*Terra Episcopi de Wirecester*.' In the first entry under Worcestershire the reference to the Hundred of Oswaldiston is very explicit as to the antiquity of the Bishop's rights. The entry begins, '*De quibus episcopus ipsius ecclesiæ a constitutione antiquorum temporum habet omnes redditiones socharum et omnes consuetudines*,' &c. Throughout the whole ninety and odd manors or portions of manors there seems no reason to believe but that they all belonged to the ancient endowments of the see. We find that Wulfstan, who was in favour with the Conqueror, having assisted at his coronation, was very active in restoring property which had been from one cause or another alienated from his church,¹ and this, perhaps, helps to account for the long list recorded in Domesday.

The Bishop of LONDON in one or two cases is mentioned by name, viz. Maurice, and he was not consecrated till April 5, 1086. The date is valuable, because it shows that it must have been after the first quarter in the year that the Survey returns were corrected. It does not appear that William of Beaufeu above referred to was consecrated to Thetford at the same time; and if afterwards, it makes it all the more annoying that we cannot determine the exact date. Bishop Maurice is returned as holding land in seventy or eighty manors,

¹ See Brompton in *Decem Scriptores*, col. 976; also Hemming's *Chartulary*. Several charters relating to Wulfstan's activity in this respect are printed in Dugdale, vol. i. p. 599, etc.

and mainly in counties adjoining his see, i.e. in Essex 32, in Middlesex 20,¹ in Hertfordshire 21, and one solitary manor in Dorsetshire.

In Essex and Middlesex and Hertfordshire, there is every reason to suppose that nearly all the manors belonged to the Bishopric and were not personally acquired by Maurice.² Here and there confirmatory notes are introduced by the clerk, such as '*Semper in Episcopatu fuit*,' or '*Tenuit Willelmus Episcopus*,' &c.—i.e. the Bishop in King Edward's time. As regards the thirty hides at Southminster in Essex, which the Bishop is said to hold in demesne, there is a very interesting note, and it is to this effect. 'This land Cnut the King seized, but William the Bishop recovered it in the time of King William.' ('*Hanc terram tulit Gnut Rex, sed Willelmus Episcopus recuperavit tempore regis Willelmi.*') This was a point which the Commissioners were of course glad to record.

The fifty manors of the LICHFIELD Bishopric, which had been temporarily removed to CHESTER, and appear under that Bishopric in Domesday, are distributed through six counties.

¹ In reckoning the manors I am met with the difficulty that the vill of 'Stibenhede' (Stepney) is divided into eleven separate portions. In the first portion there are thirty-two hides, in the second five hides, in the third five hides, and so on. Some of the later portions are very small, and are merely referred to briefly, but the earlier portions have full statistics, and under one of them occur the words '*De hoc manerio tenuit Sired*,' etc. Some appear to be held with the chief manor, others not. On the one hand, it seems unreasonable to reckon all the entries as only one manor, and, on the other, equally so to count the whole eleven; so I have reckoned them at six. Fulham, again, is divided into three, and I have reckoned them as such, since to each are given full statistics, and they are assessed at eleven, five, and five hides respectively.

² There is an entry in the Domesday for Somersetshire which is puzzling (fol. 91 a). It has the heading (in the place of the '*Tenens in capite*') '*Quod Mauricius episcopus tenet*.' This must refer to Maurice, Bishop of London. It is only a brief entry, and it begins as follows: '*Episcopus Mauricius tenet de rege ecclesiam S. Andree. Brictric tenuit T.R.E.*' This, standing by itself, would mean the cathedral church of Wells. But we know from Bishop Giso himself how far the property was confiscated in Edward's reign; and this Bishop was still living at the time of the Survey. It is almost impossible to believe that his church had been in lay hands, and was now in those of another Bishop. I cannot explain it myself, and I cannot find that it has been explained.

In Staffordshire there are twenty, leaving the remaining thirty divided among Warwick, Shropshire, Cheshire, Derbyshire, and Hertford.

To one manor in Warwickshire, and to several in Staffordshire, the scribe has added '*Hæc terra est de Ecclesia Sancti Cedde*,' and in one Cheshire manor also we find the phrase '*Sanctus Cedde tenuit*,' directly pointing to the fact that they belonged to the ancient Bishopric. To one or two the expression '*Ecclesia tenuit T.R.E.*' is added. In glancing through the several manors held by the Bishop, I have not observed any but what may well have belonged to the ancient Bishopric except those in Hertfordshire.

With regard to one of these manors, we learn that 'three thanes, "men" of Queen Edith, held this manor, and they could sell it. This manor is not of the Bishopric, but belonged to Rayner the father of Bishop Robert.'

Now without this note we might well have supposed that the land had been confiscated and given to Robert de Limesy; but we find he practically had it by inheritance, and this should lead us to exercise caution in coming to conclusions respecting other changes of property in which the Commissioners' clerk had not been so considerate towards our want of knowledge of the events which were passing and were well known when he was recording the business of the court. Incidentally, too, the mention here of Robert the Bishop gives us additional confirmation of the fact of this part of the Domesday Survey being compiled not earlier than 1086, because Robert of Limesy was consecrated Bishop of Lichfield (or Chester, as it appears here) in 1086, at the same time that William de Beaufeu was consecrated Bishop of Thetford as already referred to.

Amongst the Hertfordshire manors also there is a reference to half a carucate which lay in a manor belonging to the Bishop, '*Stigandus Archiepiscopus eam tenuit*,' and the note is added.

Probably on his being deposed it was lost, but it may possibly have been personal property, and not belonging to the Archbishopric. In two other manors entered in the same series, the land now belonging to Robert Bishop of Chester is returned as having belonged to a '*homo*' of Stigand, but in both cases it is added that the man '*vendere potuit*.' In all probability it belonged to the personal and not the official holding of Stigand, which had been dispersed and had been bought by Robert's father with the rest, and this is the reason why in the Survey the manors in Hertfordshire occur as belonging to Robert Bishop of Chester.

But before leaving the Bishop of Chester I would note that, in the city of Chester, Domesday records that he has certain 'customs.' These, no doubt, were the ancient customs, and they breathe the spirit of the dooms of King Ine, or of those 'which King Alfred and Guthrum chose,' and so point to great antiquity in their holding. The first runs: 'If any free man do work on a feast day, the Bishop has from him eight shillings. But from a serf or maid servant (*'de servo autem vel ancilla'*) who breaks a feast day (our northern friends would describe this as breaking the 'sauboth') the Bishop has four shillings.' I cannot help wishing, for the sake of the most learned historian that Chester has ever seen sitting on its episcopal throne, that the old Domesday custom was revived, especially if the fines were paid according to the relative money value of those days as represented by our own.

The fifty manors belonging to the see of HEREFORD are entered, as regards Herefordshire and Gloucestershire, under the title '*Terra ecclesiæ de Hereford*,' but, as in the case of Worcester, the Bishop's name is mentioned in the text, and at the end of the Herefordshire entries there is this note :

Amongst the whole there are in the Episcopate three hundred hides, although concerning thirty-three hides the Bishop's Men have not proved their claim [*rationem non dederint*].

Besides these manors the Bishop had three in his neighbour's county of Worcester, two in Shropshire, and one far off in Essex. They seem to have always belonged to the Church, and we find amongst the entries some seven or eight instances of those incidental paragraphs which the Commissioners, no doubt, delighted in recording.¹

[Earl] Harold held it unjustly, but King William restored it to Walter the Bishop, because it was of the Bishopric.

This was Walter, by the way, the last of the English Bishops, who was consecrated in 1061 and died in 1079. At the time of the Survey the Norman Robert de Losinga was Bishop. As to the solitary and small manor in Essex, there is a peculiarity in the tenure. A part is recorded to have been 'in the church,' and part 'in the fee of Harold.'

Next as to DURHAM. It will have been observed that I had to qualify the number of manors which the see of Durham possessed with the expression 'so far as recorded.' I used these words because the whole of the county of Durham, as well as of Northumberland, is omitted from the Domesday Survey, and probably portions of the adjoining counties. This is not the place to discuss the causes of such omission, but it may reasonably be allowed that the Bishopric of Durham possessed probably as many manors in the county bearing its own name as elsewhere, and if so that would bring it up to the same level as that of the others, if not to a higher one, as regards its manorial holdings.

The entries of lands belonging to the Bishop of Durham under Lincolnshire seem to imply that the thirty manors² ascribed to the Bishop did not anciently belong to the Bishopric. We find the expressions '*Habuit Stepiot*,' '*Habuit*

¹ The title is always written over the name, and always Earl—never King.

² Belonging to these thirty manors are some dozen Sokes and Berewics, etc. They may fairly be reckoned as equivalent to thirty-five manors.

Siward, etc., '*Nunc Episcopus Dunelmensis*.' In all probability these manors were bestowed by the Conqueror upon William of St. Carileph personally as a matter of policy—the same policy which suggested the transference of Remigius to this large seaboard county, with associations of the occupations by the Danish strangers and the continued attempts at independence made by the inhabitants of the district.

Of the fourteen manors in which the Bishop held land in Yorkshire, some appear to have already belonged to the see, for we find in one '*Episcopus Dunelmensis habuit et habet*,' and several without any name attached to them T.R.E. On the other hand, in the first two manors recorded, we are told '*Hoc manerium tenuit Morcar; nunc habet Episcopus Dunelmensis*'; so that we may be sure it belonged to the forfeited lands of the Northumbrian earl. We can scarcely suppose that the earl had unjustly possessed himself of it to the detriment of the Church, and that it was now restored, for in that case there would have been something in the formula to imply it, if indeed it would not have been vauntingly stated in full. Of the third manor we learn this history: that 'King Edward himself held it. Now the Bishop of Durham holds it.' This looks like a grant from King William to the Bishop for services rendered, and throws a light perhaps upon the two forfeited manors of Morcar. As no name is given, we do not know whether the grant was made first of all to Walcher, who died May 14, 1080, or to his successor, William of St. Carileph, who was consecrated on January 3, 1081, but most probably to the latter.

With respect to the two manors in Bedfordshire and the one in Berkshire, held by the Bishop of Durham, the entries are curious. As regards those in Bedfordshire we are told the men of the hundred testify that King Edward gave one of them to the Church of the Holy Cross at Waltham, and as to the other it is recorded that the Canons of the Holy

Cross held it 'in alms' T.R.E. In Berkshire the Bishop holds the manor of Waltham, and the historical note to this is, 'Ulwin the Canon (presumably of Waltham Abbey) held it from [Earl] Harold (the word '*comite*' being, as is usual, interlineated), and it belonged to the church of Waltham.' Now in one of the Chronicles of Waltham, William is accused of robbing the Abbey of certain possessions, but it is a question whether he would have been bold enough to take away, on any plea whatever, lands with which Harold had endowed his own foundation. It is quite possible that it was the result of an exchange or bargain of some kind, perhaps made when the king visited the Abbey in 1077, as he is recorded to have done. Still the fact remains that the Bishop of Durham for the first time became *Tenens in capite* of these three manors which the Abbey of Waltham had once held. That it was a case of their selection of the Bishop of Durham as an overlord, is improbable from the fact that the Abbey appears itself amongst the *Tenentes in capite* in Domesday, and therefore, as they held two manors in Hertfordshire, they might reasonably be supposed to be capable of holding two in Bedfordshire and one in Berkshire.

The Bishop of WINCHESTER, who is generally referred to by name as well as title, i.e. Walkelin, and who succeeded to the see on the deposition of Stigand in 1070, is returned as holding manors in nine different counties.¹ More than half the manors, which I reckon at fifty-five in all, are situated in

¹ In addition to the manors entered under the Bishop's name as *Tenens in Capite*, there are several which are entered under the name of the *Abbatia S Petri*, and the *Abbas* is the *Tenens in Capite*. To obtain an idea of the whole endowment of the church of Winchester these should be added.

In Hampshire, five are entered under the heading of *Abbatia*, and twelve under *Abbas*. In Wilts, five under *Abbatia*; in Dorset and Surrey, each one. In Sussex, three under *Abbas*. The exact distinctions between the several endowments are not kept very clear in the Survey, since Manors entered beneath the Bishop as *Tenens in Capite* are, as already noted, applied sometimes *ad victum Monachorum* &c.

Hampshire itself, namely twenty-nine, and so, near the seat of the Bishopric ; nine are in the adjoining county of Wilts, and the remaining seventeen manors are distributed in seven counties, two of which have four manors, one has three manors, two have two manors, and two have one manor each.

Under the manors in Hampshire we find frequently the phrase '*De episcopatu est et fuit*,' or '*Semper jacuit in Episcopatu*,' or '*Ipse Episcopus tenet; semper tenuit*,' or again '*Godwinus tenuit de Episcopo; non potuit ire aliubi*.' These phrases are constantly employed by the clerk to show that the manors were of old the property of the Church. When no note is given and when no other owner is named T.R.E., we may take it for granted words such as the above are understood.

In Surrey the clerk informs us that St. Peter (i.e. the Church of Winchester) always held the one manor then held by the Bishop. In Berkshire, against two of the manors we find the note, 'Bishop Stigand held it T.R.E.,' but as he was Bishop of Winchester, this is only another method of saying that the manor belonged to the Bishopric.

In Wiltshire we find in respect of the first manor specified, that two of the hides did not belong to the Bishop because they were, with three others, taken away from the Church and from the hands of the Bishop in the time of King Cnut. As the Bishop now seems to hold them, it would look as if they had been somehow restored. I observe, too, in Wiltshire another phrase to occur several times implying the ownership of a manor by the Church. 'Godric, who held it T.R.E., could not separate it from the Church.' ('*Godricus qui tenuit non potuit ab ecclesiâ separare*'), and again '*Qui tenuerunt T.R.E. non poterant ab ecclesiâ separare*.'

In Somersetshire, the passage relating to the Bishop of Winchester's tenure is mainly taken up with the customs which he holds in the vill of Taunton, and at the beginning of the passage we find that Stigand held Taunton (no doubt

quâ Bishop of Winchester), so that at once we are practically carried back to Edward's time.¹ But further in the course of the account with respect to certain lands the clerk notes, 'Those who held them in the time of King Edward could not alienate them from the Church,' and again at the end, with regard to certain lands lying to Taunton, there is the note 'that of these lands the customs and service always lay to Taunton, and King William granted this land to be held by St. Peter and Walchelín the Bishop.' The probable reason of the appearance of the note is that the question of tenure having been raised, the clerk has entered the *ipsissima verba* of the Court.

While certain customs and services had continued to be paid to the Church of St. Peter at Winchester, the Bishop had lost his right over the land by the same kind of alienation as we have seen to take place elsewhere, and which was so continually the case through neglect on the part of the responsible officers of the several ecclesiastical institutions or communities in looking after their interest. Consequently it had been proved that the lands once belonged and in law actually did belong to those to whom the customs and services were paid and done, and this decision of William's court became then the title to the land. Not that King William made the grant *de novo*, but that he confirmed the Bishop in the enjoyment of what already by right belonged to him, which right had been disputed.

In Hertfordshire, again, the solitary manor so far away

¹ 'In King Edward's Time' was sufficient for the purposes of the Survey, but we know from other sources that the vill of Taunton was given to the Church of Winchester early in the eighth century: '*Anno DCCXXI Ethelardus Rex West Saxonum. Hujus conjux Fritheswitha Regina dedit Wintoniensi Ecclesie Tauntonam de suo patrimonio. Et ipse Rex Ethelardus de sua parte addidit ad predictum manerium ad opus ejusdem ecclesie septem mansas.*' (*Annales de Wintonia*, sub anno. Rolls Series 1865.) It is perhaps difficult to identify exactly the seven *mansæ* here referred to amongst the property held in Somersetshire by the Church, but on the other hand there is every reason to believe that at the time of the Survey they continued still as part of the endowment of the Bishopric.

from the Bishop's seat appears to have been, curiously, an ancient tenure of the Bishopric, the note of the Commissioners' clerk running, 'This manor lay and lies in the demesne of St. Peter's, Winchester.' In Buckinghamshire, again, to one of the two manors we find the note, 'This manor was and is for the food of the monks of the church of Winchester [*de victu monachorum*]: Stigand held it.' To the other we find the same note as in the Hertfordshire case, 'This manor lay and lies in the demesne of the church of Winchester.' The two Oxfordshire manors in the same way are noted as belonging to the Church originally; to one we have the expression, 'Stigand held it;' to the other, 'It was and is of the Church.'

Again, to each of the four manors in Cambridgeshire, still further away from the Bishop's seat, notes are added, in the words of one or other of the above formulæ, showing that they belonged to the Church of St. Peter of Winchester originally, and were not granted by the Conqueror.

Turning next to EXETER, we find that thirty-five out of the fifty manors are in Cornwall and Devon, the two counties representing the two ancient dioceses of Cornwall and Crediton. The manors appear without exception to have belonged to the old sees. The Exon Domesday, though it gives the statistics more fully, does not appear to give any historical details touching the question at issue beyond those which have been copied off into the Exchequer copy of Domesday. It would only be tedious to recount the various formulæ used to show the ancient right of the Church in the several manors, but there is one note respecting the manor of Newton which is interesting from its explicit character. It runs: 'Concerning the manor, Bishop Osbern exhibits his charters which show that the Church of St. Peter was seised of the said manor before King Edward reigned. Furthermore, in the time of King William he proved his claim to it before the King's Barons, (*Insuper T. R. Willelmi diratiocinavit coram*

baronibus Regis esse suam'). These little details give here and there an insight into the working of the Commissioners' court, and bring before our view the venerable Bishop pointing to his charters which he had produced in court. It is a misfortune that such details are given so sparingly.

The single manor of Bentone (i.e. Bampton) in Oxfordshire, although so far away, had evidently belonged anciently to the Bishopric of Exeter also, as the words '*Leuric* [or rather *Levric*] *Episcopus tenuit*' are added. This must be the well-known Leofric whose missal is preserved, and who was consecrated Bishop of Crediton in 1046, soon after the two sees were united, and who died in 1072. It was therefore held by the Bishop in King Edward's days, and that was sufficient for the Commissioners. With respect, however, to the four or five manors in Norfolk, there is no reason to suppose they had belonged originally to the Bishopric of Exeter. The name of the *Tenens in capite* is not *Episcopus de Execestria*, but simply *Osbernus Episcopus*. Exeter is not mentioned; and this perhaps was of set purpose, just as in the case of the Suffolk tenures of Lanfranc, already referred to, where he does not appear as Archbishop of Canterbury, but low down in the list simply as Lanfrancus Archiepiscopus.¹ In other words, the manor belonged to the man—not to the dignitary.

Osbern's land seems to have belonged T.R.E. to free men, but I observe that against two of them is the designation '*homo Stigandi*.' These entries are to be compared with other examples, and notably with the case of Lanfranc above mentioned, where Stigand's name occurs in the holding T.R.E. of land now alienated to other ecclesiastical persons: and there seems good reason to suppose that together with his disgrace and deposition, his lands of all kinds were transferred to others. Without going minutely into the cases severally and comparing them with such charters as may happen

¹ See *ante*, p. 406.

to exist respecting the lands in question, it is dangerous to come to any definite conclusion. But the probabilities are that none of the ancient tenures of the see, and of which Stigand became possessed *quâ* Archbishop of Canterbury, were alienated : yet those which Stigand may have obtained personally for himself were confiscated. Still the line, perhaps, was drawn somewhat loosely, and according to the principle 'la raison du plus fort c'est toujours la meilleure' the law might easily have been made to comprehend lands amongst Stigand's personal property which were in the original gift intended for the Church of Canterbury, and which were thereby lost to it ; especially in those cases where exchanges had taken place. The circumstances themselves attending the deposition of Stigand suggest the kind of law which was administered. The three charges which seem to have been formulated would probably not by themselves have involved deposition ; but there was practically a fourth charge which did not appear on the Record, but which gave a cogency to the other charges, namely, that he was an Englishman, and one whose influence stood in the way of the Norman influence, and might at any moment prove dangerous.

We come next to the Bishop of SALISBURY, the celebrated St. Osmond, presiding over a see bringing with it memories of Sherborne and Ramsbury.

It is strange how poor it was in manorial property, holding only twenty manors in all. In the three counties where we should have expected it would have held largely, namely Berkshire, Wiltshire, and Dorset, the Domesday Record gives only three, five, and six manors respectively : so far as it appears, they all originally belonged to the Bishopric.

The precise time, or the special reasons which had caused this havoc made with the Church property, is beside the present point at issue. All that is certain is that it was not

lost by reason of the Norman Conquest. Of the two manors the Bishop held in Somersetshire, one, composed of two parts, seems to have been some personal acquisition, as the Record goes out of its way to say 'These two pieces of land are not of the Bishopric of Salisbury: Osmund the Bishop holds them for one manor.'

In Lincolnshire the entry is simply '*Terra Osmunai Episcopi*,' and the land consists of three very small portions, scarcely to be called manors, and in all three cases belonging to the church of Grantham. We possess, I believe, no documents belonging to the older church of Grantham, and therefore I cannot speak with any confidence, but my view would be that, as perhaps in some other cases, the community there preferred to trust their lands in the keeping of a Southern Bishop rather than that of the Bishop of the Diocese whose court might be biassed against them in case of encroachment. Virtually, in this instance as in the others, Osmund became what we might call a trustee. The solitary manor in Oxfordshire is described as having originally belonged to the Church, presumably the church of Salisbury.

The Bishop of ROCHESTER holds eighteen manors in Kent out of his total of twenty, and from the numerous charters &c. which are preserved, it is easy to ascertain the date at which most were assigned to the Bishopric.¹

There is an explanation, however, respecting Stoke which again well illustrates the point insisted on, namely that alienation of ecclesiastical property was very far indeed from William's policy. The record runs—

This manor was and is of the Bishopric of Rochester. But Earl Godwin in the time of King Edward bought it of two men who held

¹ For instance, Estoche was granted as early as A.D. 730 or thereabouts; Frindlesham about 750; Bronlei and Hallinges both about 775; Tottesclewe, 780; Esnocland in 830; and others later still. One or two of the early grants seem to have been lost either by sale or exchange.

it of the Bishop, and without his knowledge the sale was effected ('*eo ignorante facta est venditio*'). But afterwards, when King William was reigning, Archbishop Lanfranc proved his claim to the same against the Bishop of Bayeux, and hence it is now in seisin of the Church of Rochester ('*diratiocinavit illud Lanfrancus Episcopus contra Baio-censem Episcopum et inde est modo saisita Rofensis ecclesia*').

The reason of the Bishop of Bayeux being defendant in the suit, is that *quâ* Earl of Kent, he became lord over all the confiscated lands of Earl Godwin, and so had to do battle for the lands of which Earl Godwin had wrongfully possessed himself.

The insertion of the passage, besides being useful, is interesting. It was not probably prompted so much by the desire to give information to future generations as to show to the Church of England that a wrong done by Earl Godwin was afterwards undone, and right done *regnante Willelmo Rege*.

Besides the eighteen manors in Kent, one manor is entered under the Bishop's name in Cambridgeshire. It does not seem to have belonged to the church of Rochester, nor yet does it seem to be a personal grant to Gundulf, for it is added, he holds it '*sub Archiepiscopo Lanfranco*.' Possibly it was some land to which Lanfranc had made good claim in the courts *quâ* Archbishop, and which of old belonged to the Church, yet with its title obscure it was now settled to belong to the church of Rochester, but with homage done and certain service rendered to the Archbishop of Canterbury.

The suits which Lanfranc successfully sustained for his own diocese and the neighbouring diocese of Rochester, were determined at Pinenden (Pinenden Heath, as it is generally called), the old meeting-place of the shire, which is referred to on the first folio of Domesday, thus :

And if they shall be summoned to meet together at the Shire [mote] they will go to Pennenden—not further ('*Si fuerint præmoniti ut conveniant ad sciram, ibunt ad Pennendene—non longius*').

It may be added by way of illustration that over one important Gemot held here in 1076-7, in which the Archbishop and Earl Odo were respectively plaintiff and defendant, it was necessary to have an independent president, and Geoffrey of Coutances was chosen; in this case, it would appear that the Church got justice done, though it was to the detriment of the king's brother.¹

The Bishop of WELLS, to whom we next come, was at the time of the Survey still the Lotharingian Bishop Giso, who had been consecrated in 1061. Not having given any offence, and not being dangerous (for, if we may judge by the few lines of autobiography he has left us, he was anything but an admirer of Harold),² he was allowed to continue on in the Bishopric. Probably, as regards the individual churches throughout the diocese, the change from a Saxon king to a Norman one was not felt at all, everything going on as before. The seventeen manors (all in Somerset) which he held T.R.W. he seems to have held T.R.E., though, as we gather from his story, some had been lost, but afterwards were recovered.

We have now arrived at the one diocese which stands at the bottom of the list as the poorest of all in respect of manorial holding, namely, Chichester.

The ten manors held by the Bishop of CHICHESTER, all in Sussex, seem to consist of what was left of the endowments of the ancient Bishopric of Selsea, after the troubles of the tenth and the early part of the eleventh century. No further grants seem to have been made to Stigand, who had been appointed to the Bishopric by William in 1070. He had been the Conqueror's chaplain, and is not to be confused with the deposed Archbishop of Canterbury of the same name.

¹ See Thorpe's *Registrum Rofense*, 1769, p. 27. I believe the original of the passage occurs in the *Textus Rofensis*, but the facts are referred to by Gervase and other chroniclers.

² See *Ecclesiastical Documents*, Camden Society, 1840, p. 16.

I have thus completed a summary of the endowments of the fifteen ecclesiastical divisions of the country enjoyed by their ecclesiastical rulers, or devoted to ecclesiastical purposes over which they had more or less control. As has been observed, we occasionally find notices of certain lands appropriated to the *victus* or the *vestitus* of the canons attached to the cathedral. In some cases, lands are found, by reference to the charters, to have been left for repair of the fabric of the church; at others, evidently for the Bishop's personal use. But whatever their object, the lands were vested in the Bishop, and the Domesday Survey seldom takes note of anything beyond this one fact.

The eight hundred and odd manors thus accounted for, it must be remembered, were totally distinct from the seven-hundred manors with which, at the time of the Conquest, we find that the several religious houses situated within those several divisions or dioceses were endowed.

To go through these would take as long as the survey of the Bishops' properties has taken, and indeed longer, because we have more records relating to the monastic foundations than to the Bishoprics, and therefore one is tempted more frequently to go out of one's way to explain the circumstances connected with the details of the results Domesday so very briefly records.

Suffice it here to say, that of the sixty-two English religious Foundations returned as *Tenentes in Capite*, I find only one holding above 300 manors, and that is Bury St. Edmund. Next to that is the Church of Ely (the Bishopric had not yet been formed), with a roll of exactly 200 manors as I count them.

These two stand alone far at the head of the list. With a roll varying from between 50 and 100 manors, we find Worcester (distinct from the Bishopric), Westminster, Peterborough, Glastonbury, Ramsey, Hereford, and Abingdon.

Varying from thirty to fifty are, Mont S. Michael (Cornwall), Croyland, Coventry, St. Augustine's Canterbury, Evesham, and the monks of Canterbury and Worcester, both the latter being independent of the episcopal foundation.

This gives us a total of sixteen, and distributed amongst them a roll of about 1,250 manors.

Of those holding from ten to thirty manors, I reckon thirty-five, and those holding under ten manors, twenty-one. In other words, these 56 Religious Houses possessed between them under 500 manors. This shows the unequal disposal of the manors, not arising always from poverty of original endowments, but mainly from the inability to preserve them during the Danish and other troubles of the kingdom, from the beginning of the tenth century to the time of the Conquest.

If I had had an opportunity of treating of these monastic possessions as exhibited in Domesday, I should also have had to speak of the endowments which several Norman monasteries had obtained in England between the Conquest and the time of the Survey. This roll, however, is not a long one. I reckon in all only twenty-six foundations, with a total roll of eighty-one manors.

Rheims stands at the head with ten manors in three counties; St. Valery next; Caen with its two foundations, the *Abbaye aux Hommes* and *Abbaye aux Dames* (i.e. St. Stephen's and Holy Trinity)—the one the foundation of William, the other of Matilda—only appears on the roll with six manors to each, and those distributed in each case in four counties.

Of parish churches I have said nothing, partly from the extent to which the paper has extended, partly from understanding that they would be treated of by another contributor to the proceedings of the Domesday celebration.

One of my objects has been to illustrate, by the notes here brought together, how distinctly the endowments existing T.R.E. were respected T.R.W.; and more than that,

how their very existence at that time, proved either by charter or by oral testimony, was sufficient for them to be enrolled upon the great Survey of the kingdom, which was in effect one great 'title-deed.'

We see in the diminished number of the manors held by some of the most ancient and once important sees, that much robbery had taken place, but there is no reason to suppose that the robbery took place after the Conquest, or that it had been William's policy to allow it; and though, as I have pointed out, there were cases in which perhaps some loss had occurred, more especially in Stigand's case, there were to be set against them those cases where lost lands had been recovered and fresh grants acquired.

Between 1066 and 1086 personal gifts to the Church, no doubt, had been as frequent as ever, if not more so—some to the dioceses, some to the monasteries, some to the village churches. It is clear too that William encouraged these gifts, and made many himself.

Details we glean from other sources, but the evidence of the great respect shown by William towards the Church of England, whether actuated by mere policy, or more by admiration of her work, or consciousness of her value towards ensuring the peace of the nation—the evidence of this fact is most clearly to be drawn from the pages of the Domesday Survey.

Parish Churches Omitted in the Survey. The Presbyter.

By HERBERT J. REID, F.S.A.

‘THE Church in Domesday,’ together with its higher dignitaries, formed the subject of a highly interesting paper read by Mr. James Parker in this Hall last Thursday. Its careful preparation, and the profound research it exhibited, was so generally noticed, that I have considerable hesitation in offering my remarks, bearing a somewhat similar title, although in effect differing entirely, both in treatment and subject. My observations are upon ‘Parish Churches omitted in the Survey,’ and upon the term ‘Presbyter,’ by implication held to denote a church. Although by no means disregarding other counties, I have, in deference to a suggestion offered by Lord Aberdare, selected the majority of my examples from that county with which I am most familiar—viz. Berkshire.

The small number of churches mentioned in Domesday Book, and the apparently irregular manner of their distribution, invariably arrest our attention when submitting the Returns to careful scrutiny. By some it has been inferred from their being unmentioned that they cannot have existed; others reasoning that the term presbyter frequently encountered where no mention of a church is made, should be taken to imply the existence of one: while the absence of the words

ecclesia and presbyter is oftentimes accepted as sufficient or conclusive proof that the sacred edifice was non-existent.

After all, this is but a hypothetical and negative reasoning from which definite conclusions should not be arrived at; and although it has met with qualified acceptance from, among others, Dr. Nash, in his 'History of Worcestershire,' even he would seem to have rather accepted the hypothesis than to have based his remarks upon actual investigation.

References are found in early Cartularies to churches, and also to tithes, before or soon after the advent of King William, yet to which, in the account of the manors, no reference is made in Domesday. To this the Rev. Samuel Denne refers in a letter to the Society of Antiquaries, which is printed in vol. viii. of the 'Archæologia,' and dated June 1, 1786. At this date the first volume of the printed edition of the Domesday Survey containing all the counties to which he refers had been published three years; and it is singular he should have almost invariably taken imperfect extracts from County Histories as the authorities upon which to base his arguments, with the original references so easily accessible. The facts he pointed out are indubitable, but unfortunately his letter for critical purposes becomes of comparatively little value from this oversight. I am, however, enabled to select a few references from this letter in partial illustration of my subject.

The laws of Canute support the presumption that in his reign there were many churches. These were divided into four classes: the Heafod-mynster, or head minster, the Medemra-mynster, or *mediocris ecclesia*, the *minor ecclesia*, where there was a little service and a cemetery, and the Feld-cirice, *ecclesia campestris*, or field church, without a burial ground. It can scarcely be doubted these greatly increased under so religious a King as the Confessor, and this view is favoured by Kemble, who expresses his opinion that their number in Anglo-Saxon times was very large. To their great numerical

increase under the Confessor his own laws bear direct testimony, for in a paragraph at the foot of an enactment with reference to the payment of tithe is the following conclusive statement :—‘in multis locis sunt modo iv vel iii ecclesiæ, ubi tunc temporis non erat nisi una.’

King William, ‘who loved the tall stags as though he was their father,’ has been reproached for laying waste a large portion of Hampshire to form the New Forest. Some churches unquestionably were destroyed for this purpose. The fact is attested by no less a person than the King’s own chaplain, William of Jumieges, who, after speaking of the deaths of William Rufus and his brother Richard, says : ‘quoniam multas villas et *Ecclesias* propter eandem Forestam amplificandam, in circuitu ipsius destruxerat.’

Thirty-six churches are estimated to have been destroyed, the calculation being based upon those remaining, as recorded in the Hampshire Survey. There are entered as belonging to this county some three hundred manors, sharing among them one hundred and thirty-two churches, so that the proportion of thirty-six churches to sixty villages destroyed will not be deemed an unreasonable number. All the churches in this county are found either holding land, or pertaining to some manor.

The Survey mentions but thirty churches in Wiltshire, and these belonging principally to royal manors. The number recorded in Dorsetshire is marvellously small, only ten churches being assigned to some two hundred and fifty parishes in that county, while in Berkshire the number exceeds that of the above-mentioned two ; this is the more remarkable when we notice that the ecclesiastical bodies in Wiltshire held fully two-thirds of the land in that county under their dominion.

Berkshire, comprising in round numbers some two hundred and forty parishes, is credited with over fifty churches.

Seventeen are upon royal manors, of which there were forty-five, while the Church, possessing fifty-five manors, had but sixteen, the remainder belonging to laymen. The Bishop and monasteries of Winchester, with six manors, owned one church, and the Bishops of Durham and Chichester, as also the Abbey of Amesbury, were seemingly without, although this last is elsewhere said to have held the church of the king's manor of Ledcombe, now Letcombe Regis.

According to the estimation of Sir Henry Ellis, no fewer than eight hundred and twenty-nine churches are recorded in the three counties of Norfolk, Lincoln, and Suffolk, one half the number chronicled in the entire Survey, while in Cornwall, Lancashire (between the Ribble and the Mersey), and Middlesex they are unnoticed, and in the Cambridgeshire returns but one is mentioned.

It would be an almost hopeless task to ascertain with exactitude the number of churches existing at the time the Survey was made, yet diligent search in early records might obtain an approximate estimate. Here references should be found to payments made by William Rufus in pursuance of his father's will. Ingulphus, a contemporary writer, says, *sub anno* 1087, that William Rufus gave ten marks to all the principal churches, five marks to the lesser, and five shillings to every country church throughout England. Simeon of Durham mentions the circumstance, differing from Ingulphus only in the amount, and in this he has been followed by such later writers as Ralph de Diceto, Brompton, and Hoveden, who appear to have all copied from him.

Selden has suggested the number of churches to have been 4,511, a far more reasonable number than is given in Sprott, where it is written, 'fecit (Rex Willielmus) totam Angliam describi, quantum terræ quis baronum possedit . . . quotque Ecclesiarum dignitates. Et repertum fuit in primo de summa Ecclesiarum XLV Mⁱ XI.'

This chronicle, attributed—on far from sufficient grounds—to Sprott, an Augustin monk of Canterbury, is by no means always to be relied on, and it is certainly a remarkable circumstance that Sir Henry Spelman should receive and adopt without question in his 'Glossary' the outrageous and impossible statement, that when the Survey was made, there were in England no less than 45,000 parish churches. Then, as now, the sole authority for any such calculation must have been Domesday Book, and this grave error can only be attributed to the faulty arithmetic of the monkish writer; but it is to be regretted his error should have been perpetuated by so generally accurate a writer as Spelman.

A glance at any county map will show enormous tracts of country seemingly, at the time of the Survey, unprovided with a church, yet, by evidence of the returns, well populated. At the present time it is nearly everywhere possible to recognise, at places mentioned in Domesday Book, churches of undoubted pre-Norman times, of which the Survey has taken no account. In Berkshire, Upton and Aston-Upthorpe, admittedly Saxon churches, are not mentioned. At Burcombe and Bremhill, Wilts, it is the same, and the Anglo-Saxon Charter of King Edgar, A.D. 972, may be cited for the mention of the Cyric-Stede, i.e. Church-stead, at West Overton, although Domesday is silent as to the existence of a church. Some valuable evidence is offered by Mr. Denne in his 'Doubts &c.,' with respect to these omissions. He says:— 'Faversham in Kent, the church to which I allude, the first William gave in 1070 to the Abbey of St. Augustin, with all the tenths and products accruing from that manor. There is also in Sprott's Fragments a reference to a Bull of Urban III. dated in 1085, which restrains the monks of that Abbey from granting to any secular the church of Faversham and four other churches. And if Mr. Bridges' transcripts are to be depended on, Domesday is silent as to several churches

which are said by him to have been appropriated or given to religious houses very early after the Conquest, viz. Charwelton, Eydon, Newbottle, Grafton, Hardingstone, Moulton, Byfield, and Merton St. Lawrence. The last two were given to the Abbey of St. Ebrulf, and the grants confirmed by the Conqueror, A.D. 1081, between which time and the Survey it is barely probable these churches should have been destroyed.'

Sarisberie, or Old Sarum, and Dorchester in Oxfordshire, furnish other instances. It is possible they may have been included under the possessions of the cathedrals to which they belonged, but under their several headings in the Survey they are not mentioned as having churches. Yet it must have been so; Dorchester had long been an episcopal see, removed to Lincoln probably only the year prior to the Survey; and Domesday speaks of Remigius Bishop of Lincoln, and records the translation '*. . . habet Sancta Maria de Lincolia in qua nunc est episcopatus.*'

In Berkshire, Reading, Windsor, Hungerford, and Wallingford—this last, even at that period, an important borough—were, according to Domesday Book, without churches; but this is incredible. Under Wallingford are recorded no less than ten Archbishops, Bishops, and Monastic Houses having lands and other possessions there; three presbyters had gable of their houses, viz. Elmer, Ælmer, and Lanbertus; and a fourth, Rainbaldus, probably the chancellor of that name, held one haga. But the mention of these is plainly to record their private belongings, irrespective of the Church; for in the paragraph relating to Sonninges, a manor of the Bishop of Salisbury (which seems also to have been without a church), there is incidental mention of a church at Wallingford, by right belonging to Sonninges, but held by Rogerius the presbyter—proving not only the existence of one there, but also that it did not concern any of the priests whose names were entered as holding other property in that borough. The de-

duction is clear. The four presbyters were registered, not in respect of any church, but purely as private individuals; the casual reference to the church under Sonninges may have been a mild protest against alienations, while Rogerius having no property in Wallingford liable to taxation, his name was intentionally omitted. Mr. Parker, in his 'Early History of Oxford,' explains that most of the houses in county towns held by tenants *in capite* were connected more or less with manors in other counties, so that for the purpose of attending courts which were held in towns, it was necessary to have residences set apart for the lords of the manors; there is little doubt, he adds, that many of those houses were specially entered upon the geld rolls as appropriated to certain manors, and the expression 'jacet' or 'jacuit' so frequently met with evidently implies this.

Another incidental notice under Bristoldestone, where there was both a church and a priest, indicates also a church at Reading, with land pertaining thereto, which the Abbess Leueua had held of King Edward, belonging, at the Survey, to Battle Abbey.

One reason for the omissions may have been, and in all probability was, many of these edifices, especially the lesser *ecclesiæ*, *capellæ*, and *ecclesiolæ*, were maintained by the parent church, and without other endowment, so that it was needless to enumerate them, not being liable to taxation; occasionally some few may have been, with or without reason, admitted into the Returns, but so rarely as to scarcely need remark.

The Capella finds mention but once in Berkshire, at Haruuelle, the manor of Rogerius de Iveri, and but once in the same county, at Wautham, is noticed an *ecclesiola*, having nine acres of meadow, but as the entire manor belonged to Chertsey Abbey, and was valued at 6*l.*, it is probable the *ecclesiola* had no maintenance of its own, but was supported by the Abbey.

The ministers of the smaller churches or chapels are rarely mentioned, and in Berkshire they are encountered but twice, viz. Thatcham, where two *clerici* held a church and lands, and Windsor, where Albertus clericus held one hide and the third part of a dene. Sir Henry Ellis was of opinion that clerici and capellani were frequently domestic priests, the term being also used at times synonymously with presbyter, while *ecclesiola* has been held to have the same signification with *capella*. Of these, three are mentioned at Dartford, Kent, and the Abbey of Hortune had one *ecclesiola* at Wimborne, Dorset. At Westbury, Wilts, was a church held by a 'certain clericulus,' which Canon Rich-Jones inclined to believe meant sub-deacon, a title not encountered in Berkshire, although there is mention of one William the Deacon at Wantage in that county.

Sir Henry Ellis has remarked that the circumstance of 'presbyteri' occurring most frequently in counties where scarcely any *ecclesiæ* are noticed, gives strength to the presumption that the officers of the Exchequer who made the abridgments of the inquisitions deemed the entry of the one as in most cases implying the existence of the other, citing Leicestershire as an example, where no less than forty-one presbyters are enumerated, while the word *ecclesia* occurs in the town of Leicester only. Here Hugh de Grentemaisnell is stated to have held four churches, and the Bishop of Lincoln two, but in Norfolk, in contradistinction, *ecclesiæ* are numerous, and presbyteri few.

The term Presbyter is that commonly employed in most counties to denote the Minister, Diaconus and Capellanus being used for the same purpose in some portions of the Survey. It is not unfrequently met with in Wiltshire, where two presbyteri held *in capite*, but at Bromham in the same county the presbyter held *de terra villanorum*. They have been classed with the bordarii villani and servi, and 'England

under the Normans' has been cited, for the conjecture that the tenement of the parish priest or presbyter about equalled that of the villan, with Mr. Morgan's reminder that Chaucer's 'Good Parson' was the ploughman's brother. Some portions of the Survey may be taken to imply they were farmers of land and stock holders.

While the mention of a church is direct proof of its existence, the question arises, does the mention of the presbyter offer equally decisive evidence that a church existed also? Most certainly not always: nor often, if it ever does.

In Berkshire the presbyter is not unfrequently encountered, not, as suggested by Sir Henry Ellis, implying the existence of the sacred edifice, but almost invariably in conjunction therewith. The intent with which both were entered upon the returns appears to have been that the presbyteri were not only priests pertaining in some instances (although not always) to a church, but that they possessed geldable property as well. For the most part they are found upon king's manors, and with the exception of Reinbaldus, the Chancellor, who held the church of Cookham, with land in eleemosynary, and Edred, who held the church of Sparsholt, with a small portion of land, were liable to pay geld. As Edred held his possessions *tempore regis Edwardi*, it is not unlikely he held in Frankalmoigne; at all events, his holding was of such trifling importance, it may have been deemed injudicious to disturb him.

At Bastedene, it is written, two presbyteri held two churches which they had held *tempore regis Edwardi* worth XL. s. At Nachededorne, in the hundred of that name, of which all trace is at the present day wanting, Radulphus presbyter held the church, with one hide and half a virgate worth XL. s., while Reimbaldus, also a priest, had two hides and half a virgate, worth only xxx. s. In the manor of Shrivenham was a church with five hides where the share of

the presbyter was valued at III. pounds, and at Ferendone it is said Bishop Osbern held one hide of this manor with a church, the valuation of the portion belonging to the church, and the presbyter, being XL. s.

The coupling of the presbyter with the ecclesia is perhaps nowhere more marked than in the Wapentake of Skyrack, in the East Riding of Yorkshire ; here are mentioned thirty distinct places having churches, and no less than twenty-five of these are said to have a presbyter also. Returning again to Berkshire, the Royal manor of Celsei (Cholsey) will afford a final instance. Here the Abbey of Mount St. Michel (i.e. St. Michel in Periculo Maris, Normandy) held of the king one church, with arable and meadow land. It is debateable whether this expression 'unam ecclesiam' should be taken to imply that there was another church ; it is hardly probable, although the paragraph which follows might be read as supporting such a contention ; it is further remarkable as containing the only direct reference to tithe in the Berkshire Survey. 'Duo etiā p̄bre in ead villa teñ de rege in decima 7 eccl'a qđ vať IIII. lib.' It will be seen in all the examples taken from Berkshire, the presbyter when entered, is in conjunction with his church (excepting for reasons already given at Wallingford), and the sole instance of a presbyter in this county being mentioned without a church is upon the Royal manor of Windsor, where the *presbyter villæ* had one hide and a half.

Instances of the subtenancy of churches and church lands are not of unfrequent occurrence, and it is evident such churches as were so held had been leased or turned to profitable account by the actual possessor, while the presbyter would be not improbably a tenant at will. On rare occasions he might be independent of the tenant *in capite*, as in the manor of Hamstede, Berks, held by Teodric the goldsmith, the presbyter is said to have the church in eleemosynary.

But at Hanlie, one Tuoldus, a presbyter, held the church from Walterius Gifard, with one hide which always paid geld, and at Estralei (Streatley) Wibertus held the church from Goisfridus de Mannavilla. At another Hanlie, belonging to the Abbey of Abingdon, one Nicholaus held one hide of the Abbey which Eduuin the presbyter had formerly held, and was not able to remove from it; Willielmus belfou held the church of the king's manor of Blitberie, with five virgates which Aluric had held of King Edward, and at Stradfeld, one of the manors of Radulfus de Mortemer, a 'Miles' held land and a church with III bordarii worth in all x pounds x shillings.

Monks are occasionally found holding land, not only that pertaining to their own religious house, but independently. They may have been persons who, having taken religious vows, were for various reasons indisposed to submit to the control of their Superior, or to surrender their liberty or property. The practice was not uncommon, but two instances selected from Berkshire will suffice. We read that one Edric had given, during the Confessor's reign, ten hides of land at Spersold (Sparsholt) to his son Auschil, a monk of Abingdon. Dying previous to the Survey being made, the inquisitors demanded to be shown by what title the Abbey continued to hold the land. It seems the land of Edric's gift had descended to him from his ancestor Æthelie, who had it granted to him by King Edgar, to whom he had been chamberlain, but in whatever manner obtained the fact remains that it had been the private possession of a monk and for his own use; as such it was of course liable to taxation. The second instance is at Bedretone (Betterton), one of the manors of Milo Crispin, which Leuric, a monk, held 'Tempore regis Edwardi, et potuit ire quo voluit.' This example is equally conclusive. Leuric was a free man, and might dispose of his property as he pleased, notwithstanding he was a monk.

Before proceeding to analyse the foregoing extracts, it will be well to recall the actual instructions given to the inquisitors, according to the celebrated Ely MS. in the Cotton Collection, Tib. A. vi. It has so frequently been quoted at length that repetition is needless, but its importance in showing the minute instructions given, as also the purpose of the Survey, cannot be overrated. This last would seem briefly to have been to ascertain the quantity of each man's fee to fix his homage, to discover the revenues which should accrue to the king, and to determine what land paid or should pay tax, or, as Mr. Moore prefers to describe it, to estimate the resources of the country.

But not one word is said respecting churches; no directions were issued for their enumeration or of the officers belonging. The very writer of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, deeply prejudiced though he was, and by no means disposed to conceal his disapproval of the proceedings, while entering into minute detail as to the manner in which they were carried out, and from whom, if from anyone, such complaint might be anticipated, is silent as to any inquiries respecting churches.

The inference is plain. There being no instructions issued to the inquisitors respecting the church or churchmen, they did not enumerate them unless it became necessary, as for instance: when either held taxable property as a portion of the maintenance of the church, or as a private possession, it became needful to enter this in the Returns, and it was invariably done, but it was unquestionably done for the sole purpose of taxation, and without any intent to enumerate either churches or priests.

Where a presbyter is mentioned, either in conjunction with a church or without, he is almost invariably found to have land liable to taxation, and it was for this purpose alone that he obtained mention, viz. to distinguish the proportion of

land allotted for his subsistence, not only that his own share might bear its due proportion of tax, but also that the contribution of the manorial lord might be duly assessed. An entry under Wantage, Berks, clearly implies this. Bishop Peter formerly held two parts of the church of this manor with four hides belonging, and it is added, 'they are now in the king's hands, because they did not belong to the Bishopric; they never paid geld. The third part of the aforesaid church William the Deacon holds of the king with one hide'—it does not add he paid or did not pay geld, but it is evidently implied that he did, and the entry was made to show that although he held one third part of the church, he was responsible only for the tax upon one hide, the Bishop having the larger proportion of land attached to his two thirds.

We have found ecclesiastics of all ranks holding churches with land, land alone, and houses. We have also found that laymen held both churches and lands, which they sublet to priests, but only in the most isolated cases are churches found to be held by priest or layman without land more or less belonging; almost invariably the land is liable to taxation, and where not it is distinctly stated. It is very evident, therefore, the inquiry was directed to the land, and what it might contribute; this was the primary consideration, not the sacred edifice or the priest; and the sole reason that so many churches fail to find mention in the Survey, is not that they did not exist, but that it was unnecessary to mention them unless contributing to the revenue. The inquisitors followed the instructions in the Ely MS. to the very letter, but they did not exceed them. It is less easy to account for the large number of churches mentioned in Norfolk, Suffolk, and Lincoln, unless we assume excess of zeal on the part of the inquisitors; two of these counties are found in the smaller volume, and different inquisitors may have been employed,

or they may have been admitted by oversight when that volume was methodised. This is not improbable, as it shows less care throughout than had been bestowed upon the larger volume.

The presbyter, it has been seen, was not only a priest, but a stock owner, a cultivator of the soil, a holder of private property : as such he finds mention frequently, as do other private individuals, so that it may be said he appears in Domesday Book in a twofold character. We may then safely conclude that while the Church required a priest to conduct the services, if not mentioned he is implied, but the bare mention of the presbyter without a church should not be held to imply the existence of one, for it has been sufficiently shown that the presbyter, when he appears in Domesday Book, does so as frequently in his personal as in his official capacity, and unquestionably there must have been both many more churches and many more priests at the time the Survey was made than are recorded in Domesday Book.

The Scope of Local Elucidation of the Domesday Survey.

BY FREDERICK E. SAWYER, F.S.A.

THE present celebration has been described by one local newspaper as the climax of absurdity in the way of centenary observances, but it is strange how little light has yet been thrown on local history by most writers by their quotations from the Domesday Survey, as they have generally contented themselves with bald, and often inaccurate, translations of fragments of the Survey, which appear in isolated positions in their histories, and without any apparent connection with previous or subsequent matters. The public may therefore well ask us in a paraphrase of the words addressed to the Hebrew prophet, 'Antiquaries! can these dry bones live?'

It is accordingly for us to breathe some life into this ancient Record, and make it teach more of the past. There is little doubt that as regards the greater part of England we have not as yet obtained a tithe of the information which Domesday Book might yield us.

During nearly all my spare time in the two years before March 1886 I was engaged in investigating the Sussex portion of the Survey, with special reference to the volume recently published by the Sussex Archæological Society on

'Domesday Sussex,' and to which I contributed the table of 'Identifications of Place-names' and a map.¹

I propose, therefore, briefly to sketch out, as the result of my researches, the lines on which it seems to me further investigations can be successfully made.

PRELIMINARY STUDY.

In the first place it is very desirable to have at least a general knowledge of English real property law, or so much as may be gathered from Williams' 'Principles of the Law of Real Property,' whilst the works of Watkins and Scriven on 'Copyholds' should be carefully perused. Mr. Elton's 'Tenures in Kent' and 'Origins of English History' should be studied, and also Sir Henry S. Maine's 'Early Law and Custom' and 'Village Communities in the East and West'; whilst Mr. Seebohm's valuable book on 'The English Village Community' must be thoroughly mastered, as it is one of the most important of recent works in its bearing on early records such as the Domesday Survey. It is needless to say that a thorough knowledge of local history and topography is indispensable, as it is by cross references and comparison that much of the Survey is elucidated.

PRELIMINARY WORK.

Before discussing the portion of the Survey relating to any county or part of the country, it is essential to make (1) 'A List of Extinct and Existing Manors,' and (2) 'A Dictionary (or Index) of Local Place-Names and Toponymical Features.' There is not (so far as I know) a complete list of the extinct or existing manors in any English county, but such lists could be readily compiled, and would alone form

¹ By the kind permission of Mr. Sawyer this map is reproduced as the frontispiece to this volume.—ED.

invaluable contributions to county history; and I have often wished that the Index Society would publish such an index for some county as a specimen of what may be done. The names of present manors, with their lords and stewards, can be often gathered from post-office and local directories, and the facts thus obtained should be verified and supplemented by special inquiry of the lords and their stewards, including (as solicitors are mostly stewards) all the solicitors in the district or county under investigation. The annual reports presented to Parliament by the Copyhold (now Land) Commissioners will yield many names of local manors in which compulsory enfranchisements of copyhold property have been effected. Local and county histories afford names of extinct and existing manors. The list, when completed, will be ready for comparison with the Index of Domesday Manors, and as it has been impossible since the statute of *Quia emptores* (18 Edw. I. cap. 1) to create a new manor, it follows that all existing manors not mentioned in the Domesday Survey must have been formed by subinfeudation from the manors there recorded. It will therefore be necessary to search so as to discover the chief manor of which these sub-manors are held, or out of which they were carved. I have fully explained in 'The Antiquary' for July 1884 how to make 'Field-Name and Toponymical Collections,' and I will therefore only briefly refer to the subject here. All names of hundreds, manors, towns, parishes, hamlets, physical features, fields, &c. are entered in an index (or dictionary) with the varied spellings of the names as given in the Nonarum Inquisition, the Taxation of Pope Nicholas, Valor Ecclesiasticus, Hundred Rolls, and other documents published by the Record Commissioners, and in fact every spelling of each name should be indexed, with date and authority. Although this work may appear somewhat troublesome, it will amply repay the labour it may involve, and it will be found that

many of the early supposed mis-spellings are attempts at phonetic spelling, and some of the most puzzling of the Domesday place and manor names are identified in this way. Thus we find a modern hamlet (or manor farm) near Ringmer in Sussex named Goat Farm. Now in the Sussex dialect the word goat has two syllables, thus, *go-üt* or *gaw-üt*, and in the Survey it is *Gorde*, clearly showing the effort of the Norman scribe to represent phonetically the broad Sussex dialect. Again, there was a Domesday Manor, near Hastings, called *Fodilant*, and by applying the dialectal rules this was resolved into Footland, a Farm in Seddlescombe parish, the word 'foot' being in the Sussex dialect a dissyllable and pronounced *foo-üt* or *faw-üt*, which was therefore rendered by the foreign scribe *Fodilant*. These singular discoveries proved two points : firstly, the antiquity of the dialectal forms ; and secondly, that dialect was a key to identifying obscure Domesday place-names. Attention has of late been directed to *Dialectal Place-nomenclature*, and a glossary of dialectal forms of place-names may well be added to supplement the dictionary or index I have suggested. I have accordingly compiled such a glossary for Sussex, and this well illustrates the importance of such a collection. We find the following amongst the most striking specimens :—

<i>Domesday.</i>	<i>Modern dialectal.</i>	<i>Modern spelling.</i>
Harrundel.	Harndel.	Arundel.
Hertevel.	Hartful.	Hartfield.
Peteorde.	Pettuth.	Petworth.
Bercheham. ¹	Barkum.	Barcombe.
Salescome.	Selzcum.	Seddlescombe.
Montifelle.	Muntful.	Mountfield.
Framelle.	Framful.	Framfield.

In one case a singular change in pronunciation is shown,

¹ The *ch* is hard.

for the large Wealden parish now called *Keymer* (pronounced *Ky-mur*) appears in the Survey as *Chemere* (the *ch* being hard), and was evidently then pronounced *Kee-mur*. If Professor Skeat (or some other eminent philologist) would draw up some brief rules, having regard to the probable nationality of the Domesday scribes, the Domesday student would then know, when comparing his 'Index of Domesday Manors and Place-names' with his 'Dictionary of Place and Field-names and Toponymical Features,' what variations in spellings to look for or expect, and his identification of names would be greatly facilitated. The intimate connection between place- and manor-names and surnames must not be overlooked; and great assistance in this may be obtained from Mr. Ferguson's two works, 'Surnames as a Science,' and 'The Teutonic Name-system.' Thus we have a Domesday manor in Sussex named *Holintun*, now *Hollington* (near Hastings), and in the rear of Brighton is a hill-fortress known as *Hollingbury*, whilst on the lower slope of the hill in the adjoining parish of Preston is a tract of land named *Hollingdean*, and *Hollingham* and *Hollingdale* are not infrequent Sussex surnames. We shall, therefore, probably not be far wrong in deriving all these names from a Saxon tribe of *Hollingas*. Special attention should be directed to the Saxon charters given in Kemble's 'Codex Diplomaticus Ævi Saxonici,' or better in Mr. Walter De Gray Birch's more recent edition of the Anglo-Saxon Charters. The place-names mentioned in these require to be indexed for local reference, and it is needless to say that in many points the charters themselves will afford means of comparing and elucidating the Domesday Record on other points. Norman influence before the Conquest deserves to be carefully studied, for it is not only of importance from an historical point of view in showing how the way for the Conquest was gradually paved, but by tabulating all grants to Norman abbeyes and

ecclesiastical institutions mentioned in the Saxon charters before the Norman landing, we can check over the list of Norman landholders in the Domesday Survey. During a hasty visit to Normandy at Easter 1886, I was much struck on perusing the map, on seeing the number of names of places which the Survey connected in some way with Sussex, and I also observed that the origin of some of the names of Domesday owners could still be traced ; thus, the holders of one Brighton (Bristelmestone) manor mentioned in the Survey was William de Watevile. Now on the south (or left) bank of the Seine, near Caudebec, I found in the map a hamlet named Vatteville la Rue, evidently the home of this early Brighton lord.

HEADS FOR DISCUSSION.

Sir Henry Ellis, in his ' General Introduction to Domesday Book,' has summarised most of the principal facts under various headings, but it is well to peruse several of the separate county volumes in order to see the various modes in which the recorded facts may be grouped and compared. An account can then be opened in a note-book under the varied heads, and entries posted into it as in a ledger. Mr. Eyton, in his Dorset volume,¹ tabulates all the figures under *Fiefs*, giving in various columns (1) the names of the tenants *in capite*, (2) Tenure, (3) Hidage, (4) Free tenants, (5) Adult male population, and (6) Revenue. This is a somewhat laborious task, but may well be undertaken.

The chief heads seem to be :

I. LEGAL	{	Tenures	{	Allodial
				Ancient Demesne
				Leases for Lives
				Disputed titles
	{	Manors (tabulated)	•	
		Land Measures		

¹ p. 43.

- | | | | |
|------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------|
| | | Population | |
| | | Boroughs and their Privileges | |
| 2. CIVIL | { | Territorial Divisions | { (a) Hundreds
(b) Tithings |
| | | Parks | |
| | | Villénage | |
| | | Slavery | |
| | | Trades | |
| | | Fisheries | <i>Fish stews</i> |
| 3. COMMERCIAL | { | Mills | |
| | | Markets | |
| | | Agriculture | |
| | | Saltworks | |
| 4. MILITARY | | Castles | |
| | | List of Churches | |
| | | Progress of Religion since Christianity intro- | |
| 5. ECCLESIASTICAL | { | duced | |
| | | Clergy | |
| | | Tithes | |
| | | Physical geography | |
| | | Geology | |
| | | Animals | |
| 6. NATURAL HISTORY | { | Birds | |
| | | Fish | |
| | | Insects (Bees) | |
| | | Forests | |
| | | Devastations by Conquest | |
| 7. HISTORICAL | { | General allusions | |
| 8. PLACE NAMES | | | |

I purpose now briefly to consider some of these heads, and to point out how they may be dealt with.

PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY.

The hundred in which *Bristelmestune* (now Brighton) is situated is called in the Domesday Survey *Welesmere*, but in the Hundred Roll it is named *Walesbon* (evidently short form

of *Walesbourne* or *Wellsbourne*). Now can we learn anything from the change in the Hundred name? I think we can, for it seems that in 1086 the central valley of the town of Brighton was occupied by a lake caused by a stream due to the overflowing of Patcham well (unde nomen *Wells-mere*). This *mere* must have diminished to a bourne or stream before the date of the Hundred Roll. The *Wellsbourne* could still be traced until about twelve to fourteen years ago, when main drainage caused it to vanish. It doubtless flowed into the sea at Pool Valley. Mere and river alike are now lost. The existence of a stream is further shown in a singular manner by the Survey, for, under Prestetone (now Preston) manor (the parish adjoining to Brighton on the north), mention is made of a mill, and (windmills being then unknown) this mill must have been a water-mill and required a stream to supply it with water. Again, we have between Brighton and Lewes, Domesday manors of *Falemere*, *Stannmere*, and *Burgemere*, the names evidently derived from *meres* or lakes which occupied valleys in the Downs, and another manor, *Wintreburne*, points to a stream (still visible) which doubtless drained one or more of these lakes. The Domesday Record thus shows that this district must have much resembled the Upper Engadine, with its small lakes.

POPULATION.

Early records on this subject are very difficult to obtain, but with care some figures may be deduced from the Domesday Survey. Thus, the total number of tenants *in capite*, undertenants, cottagers, villeins, &c., in Sussex as enumerated by Sir Henry Ellis, was 10,410. These being males may probably be taken each to represent a family of ten (perhaps not an exaggerated number at that date to a household) and the total population would be 104,100. There is one earlier statement on the subject, namely that of Bede 'Eccles. Hist.'

Bk. iv. cap. xiii.) in reference to the conversion of Sussex to Christianity in 681, that the county contained land of 7,000 families. Allowing ten to a family, as before, the total is 70,000. So that in four centuries the population became half as much again. As it was customary for manors to have refuge houses in walled cities and boroughs, we can compute the number of houses some of them contained. Thus we find 122 houses in Chichester annexed to 33 manors, whilst Earl Roger (de Montgomeri), the lord of the rape, had $157\frac{1}{2}$, making the total $279\frac{1}{2}$. Two manors had also nine burgesses in the city, and if we take ten to a house and burgess, as before, the population will be 2,885. An increase of sixty houses since the time of King Edward (i.e. in twenty years) is recorded. This might at first appear strange, but we have a good illustration how the Domesday Survey may be elucidated by other records, for in 1075 a council decided on the removal of the Cathedral from Selsea to Chichester. Probably, therefore, this increase all occurred after 1075, and accordingly in ten or eleven years.

Applying similar calculations to Lewes, we find 203 houses held by twenty-seven manors, also thirty-nine houses in Pevensey Rape (probably those in the Cliffe, a suburban part separated by the river Ouse from the rest of the town) and twenty then uninhabited, making a total of 262 houses. Six manors held fifty-three burgesses also in the borough, King Edward had 127 burgesses, and although it is not expressly stated that the Conqueror had any, yet it may reasonably be inferred this was the case, and this would make a grand total of 442 households, or 4,420 inhabitants, which is a large number for that period.

PLACE-NAMES.

I have already explained the desirability of making a Dictionary or Index of place-names &c., and this will prove of service in many ways. It will be well to prepare a map

showing the approximate situation of the Domesday manors. I say approximate, because when the fact of the division of lands in the Village Community is firmly grasped, it will be seen that it is impossible to assign an exact spot for each manor. Thus we find in Sussex most of the Coast and South Down manors had lands appurtenant in the Weald, and it will be of great value when we can trace (as I hope some day to be able to do) how these appurtenant lands, after the date of the Domesday Survey, became separate manors and parishes. In the task of identifying the Domesday manor and place-names for the recent Sussex volume, the plan adopted was to make a complete index of Domesday names, this being made by Mr. Basevi Sanders. I then in each case added the identification, or such clues as could be given, and the draft list was printed and a copy sent to the clergyman of every parish in the county, to many stewards of manors, antiquaries, and others, with a request for corrections and suggestions. Many such were received, and though they were not all directly to the point, still they all tended indirectly to elucidating the work, and they will be of service in connection with a special volume of the Sussex Archæological Collections which the Society intends to publish shortly for the discussion of the Sussex portion of the Survey. In considering the Sussex place-names I obtained two striking illustrations of what we can learn from Domesday Book, and by a curious coincidence they both occur near Eastbourne, viz. at Beachy Head. It has long been a subject of debate why this well-known cape had a French name, being assumed to be *Beau chef* (Fine Head), but when we find from the map and index a Domesday manor of *Bechingetone* (now *Bechington*) in Friston and West Dean parishes, and close to the Head, we may without much fear of contradiction relegate this French derivation to the region of myth. Again, there were formerly at Beachy Head seven large masses of rock called *the Churls*,

and said to be so named from their churlish, inhospitable aspect ; but when we find a Domesday manor of Cerletone or Cerlocestone (now Charlston Manor) in West Dean, near Seaford, Litlington, and other parishes, also near Beachy Head, we can have little doubt as to whence 'the Churls' derived their name.

HUNDREDS.

It is very desirable to prepare lists showing what manors each hundred contained at the date of the Survey, and the changes effected before the Hundred Rolls were compiled, and also since. The modern parishes comprised in any hundreds can be ascertained correctly by applying to the Clerk of the Peace for the County in question. The place where the Hundred Court met should be carefully ascertained and noted, for as Mr. G. L. Gomme, F.S.A., has shown in his valuable work on 'Primitive Folk-Moots,' the Hundred Courts often met on the site of ancient folk-moots, barrows, &c.

Want of time compels me to stop, or I might have given brief notes on some other heads.

The Domesday Survey of Surrey.

By H. E. MALDEN, M.A., F.R.HIST.S.

THE Domesday Survey for the county of Surrey offers no very important or curious features, and reveals, I believe, no customs or tenures peculiar to Surrey. A detailed examination, however, of the Survey, county by county, and a comparison of the facts, may yield some information. I have examined the matter rather in the hope of such results occurring, than with the idea of presenting any points extremely important in themselves when regarded alone.

Manning and Bray, in their 'History of Surrey,' have included a transcript of the Domesday record, accompanied with a map. I have found, however, that it was necessary to draw up a map of my own to gain any idea of the topography of the county, and I have been obliged to differ here or there from the map by Manning and Bray. To begin with ; the borders of the county of Surrey, surveyed in 1086, answer generally to those of the county now, so far as in 1086 the county had any definite boundaries at all, and it had, I think, no definite southern boundary towards Sussex. Similarly an examination of the Sussex Survey will show that Sussex had no northern boundary towards Surrey. In some other particulars the county in 1086 was not quite the same as at present. Certain houses in London are rated in certain Surrey hundreds, and certain houses in Southwark in Surrey

are rated in hundreds in different parts of the county. One house in Windsor is rated in Brixton hundred, and so are two *solins* in Kent, laid to the manor of Merton, and one hide at Compton in Sussex is rated in Wotton hundred. The most important deviations, however, from the present county boundaries are as follows: 'In Cherchefelle hundred Siward holds of Richard of Tonebridge *Orde*. Oswol held it of King Edward. It was and is assessed for half a hide. There is one villein with half a plough.' This *Orde* is generally identified with *Worth* in Sussex. The name is no doubt identical. Worth is not included in the Sussex Survey, but there is a very old church there, part of which has been confidently dated as before 1086 A.D. Worth is near the present border of Surrey and Sussex, and is one of the very few places in the Weald named in the Survey of either county. If there was a church there, its not being mentioned, probably as having nothing to do with Richard of Tonebridge, is noticeable. It would seem that in another instance a place now in Sussex was then in Surrey. For when we find that Chetel the huntsman holds of the king *Lodesorde*, we may be tempted to identify it with Lodsworth, now in Sussex. There is no such place in Surrey now. Lodsworth is not named in the Sussex Domesday, and it lies in the forest, to the north of the then inhabited part of Sussex, five miles and a half south of the present boundary of the counties of Sussex and Surrey. It was a suitable holding for a huntsman. The boundaries of Surrey and Sussex must have been extremely vague when the Weald was still filled with the great forest, the Andredesleah or the Andredesweald. Indeed, though a nominal boundary of Surrey may have been fixed further south, the actual boundary of the inhabited county in A.D. 1086 ran along the edge of the lower green sand formation and of the Wealden clay. Similarly in Sussex, though not with quite such marked regularity, the northern boundary

of the inhabited county stopped at the Wealden clay, except in East Sussex where there is a sprinkling of places named standing on the Hastings beds beyond the clay. In Surrey there are two places only named in Domesday upon the Wealden clay. These are Ockley and Eversheds, both upon the line of a Roman road still in use, the Stone Street causeway, which pierced right through the Weald and served to keep these places in communication with dry and cleared ground to the north.¹ When the country was thinly inhabited the better and drier soil was, unconsciously perhaps, preferred by the people. Is this the case elsewhere? Worth is on the Hastings beds, not on the clay. There are local names in the Weald no doubt older than 1086, such as Itchingfield, Polinghurst, Friday Street (two). Were they insignificant and inaccessible, extra-manorial then, and so neglected? If they were, it appears, as is the case of Worth Church, that the Survey was not absolutely complete. Of the generally uninhabited character of the Weald there is further evidence besides the omissions of Domesday. In the 'Codex Diplomaticus' of Kemble's collection, among several places named in Surrey and not named in Domesday, two only seem to be possibly in the Weald. *Pedanbrycg* may be Pettridge, and *Leangefeld* may be Limpsfield. A *Ðunresfeld* is also named which may be Thundersfield in the Weald, but may be some lost place on the sand in the neighbourhood of Eashing, with which it is classed in Alfred's will. The names of heathen gods, Thunor, Frea, Tiw, Woden, are common all about there.

On the west also the boundaries of the inhabited county were narrower in 1086 than at present, though here the places named in Berkshire come up to near the present

¹ *Arseste* is probably Eversheds, an old manor, now only a farm in Ockley, near which it is mentioned in Domesday; but Evershed or Eversheds is a not uncommon local name. There is another Evershed farm, and there is Eversheds Rough, where the late Bishop of Winchester was killed.

Surrey boundary. But in a rectangular patch of country in north-west Surrey, thirteen miles from north-east to south-west from Chertsey to Aldershot, and seven from north-west to south-east from Virginia Water to Woking, there is one manor only named in Domesday, *Cebeham*, that is Chobham. Egham, Thorpe, and Chertsey are on one boundary of this uninhabited district, Woking, Wick, and Worplesdon on another. This was probably not forest in the modern sense, but it was all *afforested* by Henry II., and even in Charles I.'s reign was included in Windsor forest. It is a succession of barren moors of Bagshot sand, a very poor soil. Only towards Chertsey there was wood coming down into the Thames and Wey valleys, and here there are many names preserved in the *Codex*, though not in Domesday, of places belonging to Chertsey Abbey or bounding its possessions. The village of Chobham, the sole manor of Domesday, is on gravel in the valley of a stream. The Bagshot sand was not quite bare of inhabitants, however, near its edges. On all the other soils of Surrey, on the London clay, on gravel, chalk, gault, and upper and lower green sand, there are villages in 1086, except actually on the alluvium of the Wey and the Mole.

Turning to the local divisions within the county we find that the hundreds of Domesday and of the present time do not quite correspond. There are now fourteen hundreds. Chertsey or Godley, Elmbridge or Emleybridge, Kingston, Brixton, Woking, Effingham, sometimes reckoned with the following and called the *half-hundred* of Effingham, Copthorne, Wallington, Farnham, Godalming, Blackheath, Wotton, Reigate, Tandridge. In Domesday twelve of these exist with the same names. Reigate is called Cherchefelle; and Farnham does not exist. The extensive manor of Farnham is reckoned in Woking hundred; it was the property of the Bishop of Winchester, and about corresponded to the present Farnham

hundred. The boundaries, however, of these hundreds were not recorded as being exactly as they are now. But some of the differences I suspect arise from the mistakes of foreign clerks, who mixed up the hundreds of *Wodetone* and *Wochinges*. For instance, the manor of Ockley has been in Wotton time out of mind, and is completely isolated from Woking. Immediately after the entry of Ockley, come two places in Wotton hundred, and I cannot help suspecting that a careless scribe wrote *In Wodetone hundredæo* after instead of before Ockley. A confusion of the names *Wodetone* and *Wochinges* is also possible, especially when we find three or four places now in Woking put into Wotton. These are Worplesdon, Week, Burgham and Littlefield. The first three are all together and held by Earl Roger. There can be no reasonable doubt of their identity; they are now in Woking hundred, but in Domesday form an isolated patch of Wotton—unless, as I say above, a scribe wrote *Wodetone* for *Wochinges*. Are similar mistakes made elsewhere? Littlefield, identified with a farm in Worplesdon, is put into Wotton, but it is quite possible that it may be another place now lost. The mention of it stands between Anstie and Abinger, both in Wotton hundred. Chessington, now in Copthorne hundred, was then in Kingston; it is on the borders of the two. Banstead is generally now assigned to Copthorne hundred; the manors of Borough and North and South Tadworth in Banstead parish now are and were in Copthorne in 1086, but Banstead was then in Wallington hundred. As we shall see, it had a local usage connecting it with Wallington, and in Speed's map, done in the year 1610, it is marked in Wallington.

There are now and were then two manors of *Betchworth*, the changes concerning which are rather complicated. At present East Betchworth, where is a church said to contain Norman work, is in Reigate hundred. West Betchworth, where there is, so far as I can gather, no record of a church, is

in Wotton hundred. In 1086 Richard de Tonebridge held a Betchworth with a church in Wotton hundred, and another Betchworth in Copthorne hundred. This latter Betchworth was made over to him *with the manor of Thorncroft in Copthorne*. I therefore believe it to be West Betchworth, now in Wotton, the boundary of which reaches up on to Boxhill in the direction of Thorncroft, while the Betchworth *with a church* then in Wotton hundred I take to be the East Betchworth with a partly Norman church, now in Reigate hundred. Anyhow, there has been some alteration of boundaries, and I believe that this is the best explanation. On a variety of other manors there is land rated in different hundreds. Sometimes, as in the case of Sutton, which is partly in Wotton and partly in Blackheath, this division still exists. Sometimes, as in the case of Bramley and Streatham, it is impossible to tell which parts of a manor were then counted in different hundreds.

Very few places mentioned in Domesday are sites not now recoverable. *Driteham*, *Pechingeorde*, and *Bramselle* are such. *Minchin* is said to be represented by a farm in Leatherhead, but my local information has failed to find it. *Driteham* and *Pechingeorde* are traceable within certain limits. Both are in the small Effingham hundred. *Driteham* is named in a charter of A.D. 987 as apparently not far from Byfleet, and if so must have been in the north part of Effingham hundred. *Pechingeorde* is named in charters of A.D. 812 and 1062 in connection with Bookham and Effingham as belonging to Chertsey. It was held by Oswald, and its former possessor was *his brother the abbot*. Perhaps he was an Abbot of Chertsey, by whom the land may have been alienated. Colonel Sir H. James, R.E., supposes the manor to have been on the chalk downs, towards the south of Effingham hundred, and it may have been so. There is a nameless manor in Tandridge hundred, mentioned between Tillingdon and

Chelsham, which may probably be Caterham. Other places, such as Witford and Whattingdon, not now existent, are historically recoverable.

Of the places named, none except Guildford and Southwark have any pretension to rank as towns. No castles are named. Guildford, Farnham, and Reigate castles must have been built not long afterwards. The Abbey of Chertsey,¹ and a monastery, now the minster church of St. Mary Overie, at Southwark, are the only religious houses mentioned. There are churches named at fifty-nine places. At Bramley there were three churches, perhaps Bramley, Wonersh, and Chilworth. At Epsom there were two; one was probably Stamford chapel, now long demolished; there were two at Sutton in Wallington, one, perhaps Watendene chapel, now lost; and there were a church and chapel at Chobham. The latter has disappeared.²

The population was scattered fairly generally over the whole county with the exceptions given above. The whole male population enumerated is 4,370, with four women, excluding the tenants-in-chief (36) who were not, generally speaking, inhabitants of the county. Besides the women and children, however, we must add to the population the inmates of the monasteries at Chertsey and Southwark, the clergy of the 64 churches and chapels, and the inhabitants of 52³ houses mentioned in Southwark. In Guildford, in 75 houses,⁴ there dwelt 175 homagers, so that about 120 probably dwelt in Southwark, where 16 villeins, bordars, and serfs are also

¹ With the exception of the Abbey of Westminster, which held Pirford (*Peliforde*), the Abbey of Chertsey is the sole landholder in Godelei hundred.

² On an average about one church is named to every 70 *men* enumerated, or at least one church for every 350 of the population all told.

³ Of these 52 there are 15 described as in 'London and Southwark,' some in one, some in the other.

⁴ *Haga*, that is *Enclosures*, probably surrounding a block of semi-detached cottages. There are evidently more families than *haga*.

enumerated. These were the most populous places mentioned, but there are 120 people mentioned at Kingston, 110 at Mortlake, 140 in the large manor of Bramley, 79 at Godalming, 78 at *Cherchefelle* (or Reigate), 69 at Battersea, 50 at Shalford. The whole population, including women and children, may have been about 20,000, if we multiply the men by five, and deduct a few for clergy without wives, and for the waste of a probably not increasing population.

Analysing the character of this population brings us to some of the most interesting points which I have been able to notice. There are few English tenants-in-chief, and the most considerable of these, along with most of the men who held land in T.R.E., appear as worse off in one way or another. Oswald, a thane, is the most considerable. He still holds lands near the borders of cultivation at Fetcham, *Pechingeorde*, Wotton, and Wisley which he held T.R.E. The holder of one virgate in Copthorne hundred put himself under Oswald's protection with his land 'from the time King William came into England.' Joining this with the entry that Oswald became a tenant of Richard de Tonebridge for land at Effingham in King William's time, we may conjecture that he made his peace early with the king and loyally supported him. At Mitcham,¹ however, he had become the tenant of Richard de Tonebridge for land which he had himself held of King Edward. Another Englishman, of the name of Azor, who was dead at the time of the Survey, was not dispossessed of all his land when King William came. He held land at Effingham in the time of King Edward, and bought more land there of a freeman in the time of King William. He held Henley-in-Ash till he died, and made it over to the Abbey of Chertsey for the good of his soul. Still he had other estates which at his death or before it passed into foreign hands. Teodric the goldsmith, perhaps a

¹ Or Mickleham.

naturalised foreigner, held land in the time of King Edward, and at the date of the Survey held the same land of King William. Ansgot the interpreter held land of King William which another man had held in the time of King Edward, but the same or another Ansgot had held other land under King Edward, and was still an undertenant upon it at the time of the Survey. Chetel the huntsman holds land which his father held, and Wulwi the huntsman holds land which he himself held of King Edward. The huntsmen, goldsmith, and interpreter were too useful to be disturbed. A certain number of free Englishmen remained as subtenants in the occupation of land sometimes since King Edward's time. Thus an Englishman held two hides at Chertsey, Edric half a hide at Chertsey since T.R.E., Godric one hide at Week, Siward at Worth. But there are two small tenants at *Mideham* holding land directly of King William which they held of King Edward, Seman and Godwin by name. At Wandsworth there were T.R.E. six sokemen of whom four remained, Ansfrid with a holding assessed formerly for five hides now for one, Heldred assessed for three now for none, Ulward then and now assessed for three, Walter the vineyard keeper, no doubt one of King Edward's foreigners, then and now assessed for one. There seem to have been four men in Thorncroft and Betchworth who remained degraded from owners to subtenants. A 'free man' remained on his land in Wallington hundred, but now under the protection of Walter de Dowai. At Carshalton there was one freeman, Wesman, remaining out of five T.R.E., holding six hides of Geoffrey Fitz Eustace. At the same place one of the king's smiths held T.R.E. and holds half a hide. A certain widow holds and held T.R.E. a hide at Bramley under Bishop Odo. 'One Englishman' holds as a subtenant one hide at West Horsley. All other Englishmen or tenants of King Edward mentioned are simply stated 'to have held land;' what had become of them is not added. It is notice-

able that these Englishmen who still hold land live mostly in the outlying parts of the county, where either land was less valuable or they were less easy to dispossess. The only considerable English tenant-in-chief, Oswold, has most of his land on the outskirts of cultivation.

There are a few notices of wrongful, or at least unwarranted possession. The king in several cases is said to be deprived of his rights, as at Ewell, over two hides and a virgate, by the action of dishonest reeves. However, Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, the Conqueror's half-brother, who was, we may remember, in disgrace before 1086, is the chief offender. He is charged with withdrawing the customary payments of a house in Guildford from the king, of having deprived one of the king's reeves of the manor of Farncomb, of taking land in Weybridge with no livery officer nor writ to put him in possession. In Southwark he is accused of having usurped the King's share of wharfage dues, and apparently of having bullied the Sheriff into withdrawing from a suit for its recovery. He also is said to have wrongfully laid to his own manor of Bramley two hides in Clandon belonging to the Abbey of Chertsey. From the church at Lambeth he has stolen a parcel of arable land. At Battersea the church of Westminster was seised of two hides in the time of King William, and afterwards the Bishop of Bayeux disseised it. In the same manor the Earl of Moretaine holds a hide and a half which, apparently, the church of Westminster held in the time of King Edward and for some time afterwards (*quæ ibi erat T.R.E. et post aliquandiu*). Again in the same manor the Abbey of Chertsey is accused of having wrongfully acquired one hide from Westminster by the action of a reeve of the town. Chertsey itself however claims the lordship of two and a half hides which Richard Sturmid holds directly of the king at Chertsey. Geoffrey de Mandeville is said to be wrongfully holding Clapham, on the plea apparently that he had received a grant of Asgar's land,

while this was never Asgar's. Either one Wigot, or the successor to Wigot, was in like manner wrongfully claiming Chesington. At Wallington it is said of Richard de Tonebridge that *abstulit rusticum qui ibi manebat*. Probably not personal abduction is meant, but that he deprived him of his rights in the land. In other cases doubt is thrown upon the right of the occupier of land, but the question is between foreigners, not between foreigners and natives.

The distribution of the servile and semi-free population is very remarkable. There are 2,382 *villani*, 922 *bordarii*, 276 *cotarii*, and 503 *servi* enumerated.¹ What is at once remarkable is the smaller proportion of *servi* on monastic and chapter lands. Putting aside the estates of the bishops, on the church lands strictly speaking, belonging to Westminster, Winchester, Chertsey, St. Wendrille's and St. Leutfred's in Normandy, Battle, Barking, St. Paul's, and Lambeth, land which except in the case of the Norman churches and Battle had been held almost entirely from King Edward's time onward, the number of *servi* is 42 only to 751 semi-servile, or semi-free, cultivators. That is to say, on church lands the proportion of absolute serfs is about $5\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the population, on the bishops' and lay lands it is more than 16 per cent. Twenty-three of the forty-two serfs on the church lands are on the small estates which had come to them since King Edward, but the newly endowed Norman churches have no serfs. Either the monastic houses had been manumitting their serfs, or they were less hard in the first instance on those who bowed themselves to them for need.

Another curious point is the distribution of the *bordarii* and *cotarii*. One tenure or the other would seem to prevail according to local custom, for they only occur once together on the same manor, and very seldom in the same hundred.

¹ These figures are not quite the same as those given by Sir H. Ellis. I can only say that they are the result of a five times repeated verification by myself and another.

They both occur with *villani* and with *servi*. There are three hundreds, Godalming, Wallington, and Elmbridge, where the *cotarii* are nearly universal, to the exclusion of *bordarii*. In the others the *bordarii* are nearly or quite universal, to the exclusion of the *cotarii*. In Godalming hundred there are *cotarii*, and no *bordarii* except at Godalming itself, where there are *bordarii* on the part of the manor which is in royal demesne, an exception which may be compared with the state of things at Wallington. In Wallington hundred there are many *cotarii*, and *bordarii* at only two places, at Wallington on King William's land and at Croydon on the Archbishop's. In Elmbridge hundred there are *cotarii*, and no *bordarii* except one *bordarius* at Weybridge and some at East Moulsey. In Blackheath hundred there are *cotarii* at Bramley, along the borders of Godalming hundred where *cotarii* abound, and in Brixton hundred there are *cotarii* at Tooting on the borders of Wallington hundred. In the rest of these and in the other hundreds there are *bordarii* and no *cotarii*. The three 'cotarian' hundreds are not adjacent, they are not on some peculiar soil which might imply some peculiar form of industry or tenure, they are not in the possession of the same people. Indeed they represent all the soils of Surrey. Godalming, the sand bordering the Weald and the chalk; Elmbridge, the Bagshot sand, London clay and alluvium; Wallington, the chalk and London clay. Besides the local distribution of the two tenures, the only rule for their occurrence seems to be that there are no *cotarii* on royal demesne. All the land in the king's own hand had been held by King Edward, Queen Edith, Earl Harold, or Archbishop Stigand. It would be interesting to know whether similar local distributions of the two tenures are to be found in other counties. It is indeed chiefly with a view to starting inquiries into such analogies that I have thought it worth while to submit these purely local notes to a General Domesday Committee.

On an alleged instance of the Fallibility of Domesday in regard to + Ancient Demesne.+

BY SIR HENRY BARKLY, K.C.B.

IN the Introduction to the 'History and Cartulary of the Monastery of St. Peter's, Gloucester,' published under authority of the Master of the Rolls, the learned editor, after adverting to a charge brought therein against the first Roger de Berkeley, of having caused Nympsfield, in that county, to be wrongly described in the Survey of 1086 as 'among the king's lands,' 'unknown to Abbot Serlo,' proceeds, on the strength of this alleged inaccuracy, to argue that the doctrine, that there can be no appeal from Domesday Book, requires qualification, and that, although a valuable record, it is not infallible.¹

I venture to suggest that if Mr. Hart had looked more closely into the matter, he would, instead of arriving at such a conclusion, have satisfied himself that the charge referred to is not merely unsupported by, but inconsistent with, the evidence presented.

The following are the entries in the Calendar of Donations appended to the History, viz.,

1. 'Nimdesfelde datur, aufertur, et hinc ² revocatur.' 'A. D. millesimo octagesimo septimo, Rogerus, Senior, de Berkelee, in

¹ See Appendix A for passage at full length.

² Mr. Hart has '*huic*,' but I follow the Monasticon version as preferable.

descriptione totius Angliæ, fecit Nymdesfeld describi ad mensam regis,¹ Abbate Serlone nesciente.'

De eodem.

2. 'A. D. millesimo nonagesimo tertio, Eustachius de Berkelee reddidit Deo et Sancto Petro Glouc. Nymdesfeld, tempore Serlonis Abbatis.'

De eodem.

3. 'Rex Willielmus primus concessit terram de Nymdesfeld, ecclesie S^{ti} Petr. Glouc. et Ab^{ti} Wlstano, ad habendam tam plene et tam perfecte sicut fuit in primordio, et in diebus Edwardi regis cognati sui, cum saca et soca in omnibus rebus, et noluit ut aliquis faciat illi injuriam.'

A fourth entry, having an important bearing on the others, occurs at another place under the heading

De Clehangrâ.

'Rogerus de Berkeleye, Junior, A. D. millesimo nonagesimo quarto, dedit Deo et S^{to} Petr. Glouc. quandam terrulam Clehangrâ nomine, consensu et confirmatione regis Willielmi junioris. Abstulit vero Nymdesfeld, tempore Serlonis Abbatis.'

The twofold question arises, at what period was the register containing the History and Calendar of Donations compiled, and on what authority do the statements in them rest? Their compilation is generally ascribed to the latest Abbot they mention, Walter Froucester, who ruled from 1381 to 1412, and who is indeed expressly named therein as having 'made the Register anew.'² Mr. Hart however is of opinion that he

¹ Mr. A. J. Ellis (Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society, vol. iv.) considers these words to mean 'bound to supply provisions for the king's table,' an explanation which would reduce the charge against Roger to one of having ignored the exemption of abbey lands from the usual corrody. Mr. Hart's translation however is more in accord with the accepted signification of the phrase (see Ducange: *Mensa regalis*), and Domesday besides shows clearly that Nymdesfeld was actually included as a portion of the fee which Roger de Berkeley held from the crown.

² 'Ut patet in registris de novo factis tempore domini Walteri Froucestre Abbatis.'—*Historia*, vol. i. p. 50.

merely re-arranged what had been previously recorded from time to time by successive inmates of the monastery, and cites one passage—as to Abbot Walter de Lacy—which could only have been written by a contemporary, and therefore in the twelfth century.

As a rule, nevertheless, whatever original materials existed would seem to have been entirely recast in the composition of the History. This is well exemplified in the case of the passage recounting Abbot Serlo's acquisitions (Nympsfield included), which winds up by referring for fuller information to the Calendar of Donations annexed,¹ arranged under the letters of the alphabet.

That this alphabetical Calendar, which includes all donations up to the beginning of the fifteenth century, was the work of Walter Froucester himself, is rendered highly probable by the doggerel Latin rhymes interspersed throughout the manuscript,² for the abbot was so proud of his skill in this respect, that he took care to affix his name as composer to a poetical history of the Abbey which he caused to be inscribed in the cloisters.³

It may perhaps be urged, as before, that he did little more than furbish up the old records of the Monastery, but any one who will take the trouble to go through the Calendar will find so many blunders in it both as regards dates and names, as

¹ 'Domnus Abbas Serlo . . . terras multas et pecunias acquisierat, . . . Sottesshore, Nymdesfelde, Cleyngre, . . . et alia multa quæ continentur in Kalendario donationum juxta litteras Alphabeti inde confecto ut infra patebit.' *Ib.* vol. i. p. 12.

² The distich as to Nympsfield has been already quoted, p. 1. A few other examples are given to show the identity of style.

'Hic Sottesshora, gratâ largitur in horâ.'

'Hic templum clari Martini Lundoniarum datur cum terraque, velut inferius memoratur' (p. 94).

'Terra potest cerni, templum datur benigni Paterni' (p. 106).

³ It concludes—

'Walterus studuit Froucestre, et hæc memoranda
In scriptis posuit claustralibus, enucleanda.'

to preclude the idea that the entries were made at or near the periods to which they relate. Some of these blunders are pointed out in a footnote as specimens.¹

No doubt, in spite of such minor inaccuracies, the substance of the entries was in most cases derived from documents which had either been copied into the Cartulary—a finely written manuscript of the thirteenth century, ascribed to Abbot John de Gamages (1284 to 1306)—or which were preserved in original; but where such corroboration is wanting, it is plain that allegations in conflict with other evidence ought to be received with the utmost caution.

Now this is the case with the entry as to the gift of Nympsfield to the Abbey by King William the First, which is not only unvouched for by any deed, but is indirectly impugned by the silence of a general charter of confirmation from that monarch, dated in the last year of his reign, copy of which is entered in the Cartulary.²

Moreover the story is so told as to excite grave suspicion. The gift is said to have been made to Abbot Wlstan, thus placing its date between the beginning of 1068, when William visited Gloucestershire after its subjugation, and the beginning of 1072, when Wlstan died on his road to Jerusalem.

It is hard to believe, in the first place, that the Saxon

¹ To take the Berkeley family only; the first Roger's restoration of Shotover, A.D. 1091, is stated to have been confirmed by the Conqueror (Rege Willelmo Seniore confirmante), whilst the gift of the church of Cam by his grandson, A.D. 1156, is said to have been confirmed by Henry the *third*. Similarly as to names, *Roger*, son of Maurice de Berkeley, appears as donor of the mill of Berkeley, instead of Robert, the third Baron, a blunder not likely to be committed till long after his decease. A far graver mis-statement is made in an entry about Maysmore, which concludes—*Willelmus Comes Gloucestræ confirmat, tempore Serlonis Abbatis*, Serlo having died in 1104, up to which date the Earldom had been held by no one save Robert Fitz Hamon, whose grandson William did not succeed to it until 1148.

² The way in which this important charter is inserted is very strange. It is headed 'cccvi De hyda de Aspertone,' a title which, as remarked by the Editor in a footnote, is quite inapplicable. That place is not even mentioned in it, although the *hide* there is confirmed under the name of its donor.

Abbot of Gloucester stood so high in the favour of the Conqueror as to obtain the retrocession of lands seized since the Conquest, and harder still that, being able to exercise such great influence, he immediately afterwards deserted his post to set out on a pilgrimage, leaving the affairs of the Monastery in such confusion that, as William of Malmesbury reports, there were only three monks remaining when his successor was appointed. Conscious apparently that the alleged gift to Wlstan could not hold water, the acquisition of Nympsfield is credited in general terms in the History to Abbot Serlo, his successor, who, having accompanied the Conqueror from Normandy as chaplain, was of course far more likely to have obtained the boon.

That one of Serlo's earliest acts was to use his influence with the king towards securing the recovery of manors of which the Abbey had been deprived, would be clear if we could admit the authenticity of another charter,¹ purporting to be from that king, restoring certain manors alienated in Saxon times for the endowment of the Archiepiscopal See of York; but this it seems impossible to do in consequence of its being addressed to Bishop Wulstan of Worcester, and *William FitzOsborne*, the latter of whom was slain in Flanders in February 1071, whereas Serlo, in whose favour it is granted, was not installed as abbot till September 1072!

This, however—except in so far as it shakes confidence in the Cartulary—has nothing to do with Nympsfield. It is the absence of any mention of that manor in the charter previously alluded to, which conclusively proves that it was never given nor confirmed to the Abbey by the Conqueror.

That charter² is dated in 1086, and as we know from history that William held his Court at Christmas in that year,

¹ See Appendix B.

² See Appendix C.

the last of his life, within the precincts of Gloucester Monastery, it was presumably executed on that solemn occasion. The execution was certainly subsequent to the completion of the Survey in the previous October, for the first clause is devoted to confirming to St. Peter's the lands that Archbishop Thomas of York had held, which (despite the alleged restoration of 1072) stand in his name in Domesday Book.

The preamble recites that this was done on the petition of Serlo himself and certain of the chief nobility, a sufficient proof that the astute and energetic abbot was well aware of the contents of the volume, and lost no time in endeavouring to get whatever was contrary to the interests of his house rectified. Yet, although this post-Domesday charter of the first William goes on to confirm the donations, not only of himself, but of more than a dozen of his Barons—including that of Clehanger (another portion of the Berkeley lordship),¹ by Roger de Berkeley—it says not a word of Nympsfield, which apparently remained unchallenged as described in the Survey.

Nor, in spite of the attempt made by the abbot some years after the Conqueror's death, as chronicled in the Calendar, did the monks ever succeed in establishing a valid claim to that manor. It is not named among the possessions of the Abbey in the long list confirmed by King Stephen in 1138, and it must have been retained by the Berkeley family down to the forfeiture of the third Roger in 1152, since it was then settled by Robert FitzHarding on his second son, Nicholas,² whose descendant is recorded as having exhibited the confirmatory charter of Henry the Second at the *quo warranto* inquiry at Gloucester in 1287; and whose issue male

¹ Shotesore is not mentioned, thus confirming the statement that it was not restored by Roger until he entered the Monastery in 1091.

² See copy of grant in Smyth's 'Hundred of Berkeley,' under 'Hill.'

continued to hold it from the crown until the death of Sir Thomas FitzNichol in sixth Henry the Fifth.¹

In face of these facts, it seems not unfair to assume that the entries giving a contrary version were made in the fifteenth century manuscript, with a view of accounting for and justifying the attempt of Abbot Serlo already referred to, which had given rise to much litigation. The allegations in them as to the gift of Nympsfield by the Conqueror, and the consequent misdescription of it in Domesday, have already been sufficiently refuted; but as those concerning its subsequent cession to the Abbey by Eustace de Berkeley are more specific and appear to give some colour to the claim, it may be well before concluding to trace the story to its origin.

It is not to be denied that from an early date the Church of St. Peter's had an interest of some sort in Nympsfield. The very name testifies that Nuns (Nymphs or Brides of the Church, in Saxon phrase) were once the principal landholders in the parish, and we are informed in the History that not long after the foundation of the Monastery, Aldred, sub-regulus of the Wiccii, gave, among other endowments, to St. Peter's, Gloucester, and the Nuns of the place, three tenements² in Nymdesfeld.

This was during the time of the Abbess Eva (735 to 767), but as we are told by the same authority that on her death the Nuns left the Monastery, which remained desolate for

¹ Cal. Inquisition. post mortem, 6 Hen. V. Thomas Fitz Nicholl, Chivaler.
 Nymdesfeld Manor
 Kynlege Advoc Cantuar. } Glouc.

² 'Tres manentes.' So translated by Mr. Hart, and doubtless correctly, for although Du Cange defines as 'Manentes'—'qui in solo alieno, in villis: quibus nec liberis suis, invito domino, licet recedere,' the word here evidently refers to their place of abode, for the sentence ends 'has terras dedit Aldredus.' Moreover King Burgred confirms more than a century afterwards these 'tres manentes,' so that they cannot have been three serfs, but the tenements in which they dwelt. It has been suggested that the *three* 'manentes' were represented by the *three* hides of Domesday, but if the entire manor was given, why describe these three tenements as *in* Nympsfield?

more than half a century, this grant must have lapsed. In 823 Bernulph, King of the Mercians, appropriated part of its possessions towards the maintenance of married Secular priests, and one of his successors, Burgred, in 862, when confirming these priests in their lands, refers to the three tenements in Nympsfield, which appear to have developed into a Priory or College called (though not in the Cartulary) Kinline or Kinley.¹ What was the fate of that establishment when King Canute in 1022 turned the Seculars out of the Monastery at Gloucester to make room for Benedictine monks, is not recorded. A few families may have been suffered to linger on in so remote a locality, but these had apparently died out long before the Conquest, as Nympsfield had, according to the evidence of Domesday, fallen into the hands of Edward the Confessor, together with the rest of Berkeley Hernesse.

It was therefore a bold stroke of Abbot Serlo's to lay claim to that and other manors on behalf of the Benedictines, as heirs general of the despised Secular priests, whom they had ousted from their headquarters at Gloucester half a century earlier. He apparently took the opportunity of doing so very soon after he had induced the first Roger de Berkeley to assume the cowl in 1091, and the design was no doubt facilitated by the dangerous illness of William Rufus two years later at Gloucester, when that king made a vow to surrender all Church lands if he recovered.

It can hardly be questioned that the restoration of the lands of the ancient Priory of Kinley to the monks in 1093, by Rufus, of which Bishop Tanner speaks, was the same transaction as the restoration of Nympsfield in that very year attributed in the Cartulary to Eustace de Berkeley, nor could the revocation of the latter grant in the following year by the second Roger de Berkeley have taken place except with the

¹ See Tanner's *Notitia Monastica*, edit. 1787. He refers to Prynne's *Records*, vol. iii. p. 247.

King's sanction, which is indeed implied in the announcement preceding the notice of it, that Roger's confirmation of his father's gift of Clehanger was made with *the consent of King William Junior*.

It seems not improbable that the act of repudiation was occasioned by an attempt on the part of the monks, availing themselves of the looseness of phraseology as to manors then prevalent, to contend that the *whole* of Nympsfield had been restored to them, instead of Kinley only. The latter, comprising the ancient chapel, together with a virgate of land in Nympsfield, must have been again relinquished by Roger de Berkeley (II.) before the death of Abbot Serlo, probably through the intervention of their diocesan, for by a charter dated in 1100, Sampson, Bishop of Worcester, was able to secure to the Abbey of Gloucester an annual stipend of two marks in the *Chapelry of Nimesfeld*,¹ whilst we find it recorded in an agreement dated in 1185, between Abbot Thomas and Nicholas, son of Robert (Fitz Harding) as to the endowment by the latter of a Chantry within this Chapel, that he engaged to restore 'a certain virgate of land which it possessed of old time from the gift of his predecessors,'² who were, of course, of the earlier house of Berkeley.

Notwithstanding this agreement, constant disputes regarding the right of presentation, visitation, &c., occurred between the monks and the Fitz Nichol family, the only noteworthy point being that the former's tenure of property in the parish was invariably declared to be of a subordinate character; or, to use the words of Smyth, 'the old and rich Chantry of Kinley, often written as the manor of Kinley,' was holden of the manor of Berkeley Hernesse by fealty only for all service.³

¹ *Cartulary of St. Peter's*, vol. ii. p. 41.

² *Ib.* p. 42.

³ Smyth's *Hundred of Berkeley*, p. 301: 'Præfatus vero Nicolaus quandam virgatam terræ quam antiquitus capella ex donatione antecessorum suorum pos sedit eidem in elemosinam perpetuam restituet.'

To conclude, it has been shown that the Cartulary of St. Peter's, Gloucester, furnishes no proof that Nympsfield was granted by King Canute to the Benedictine monks whom he established in that Monastery in 1022; nor that they held it in the time of Edward the Confessor; whilst the fact of its not being mentioned in the general charter of confirmation from William the Conqueror in the last year of his reign, affords the strongest possible presumptive evidence that that king never gave nor confirmed the manor to the Abbey.

It has been further shown that the account of its alleged restoration to Abbot Wlstan cannot be traced further back than the Calendar of Donations compiled under Walter Froucester, who was abbot from 1381 to 1406; and also, that the small portion of land in Nympsfield conceded to Abbot Serlo in the reign of William Rufus was held by the monks as soccage tenants of the lords of Berkeley.

There is no reason, therefore, for doubting that the three hides in the berewick of Nympsfield were rightly described in the Survey of 1086 under the head of 'Terra Regis;' nor for discrediting, in this instance at all events, the authority of Domesday in the determination of 'ancient demesne.'

APPENDIX A.

EXTRACT FROM THE INTRODUCTION TO THE CARTULARY OF THE MONASTERY OF ST. PETER'S GLOUC. vol. iii. pp. xx, xxi.

'The method in which Domesday was compiled receives a curious illustration from the Gloucester Cartulary; in fact, one of the returns in that grand and memorable record is alleged to be incorrect, and this in no unimportant degree. We are told that William I. granted to St. Peter's and to Abbot Wlstan, Nympsfield (Nymdesfeld) in Gloucestershire, with sac and soc; but in 1087 Roger de Berkeley the elder caused it to be described in Domesday as among

the king's lands, "ad mensam regis" unknown to Abbot Serlo; however, in the year 1093 it was restored to the monastery by Eustace de Berkeley, "tempore Serlonis abbatis;" thus showing evidently that whether the false return was made wittingly or not, at all events Serlo did not allow it to remain unnoticed or unremedied.

'To many persons this misstatement in Domesday and its subsequent correction may seem of little moment; but it really involves an important legal point, as I shall endeavour to show. It is sometimes necessary in a court of law to adduce evidence in support of land being of that peculiar tenure called "ancient demesne," and the only way in which it can be established is by an appeal to Domesday. "The tenure of ancient demesne," says Scriven in his work on Copyholds, "is confined to such lands as were held in socage of manors belonging to the crown in the reign of Edward the Confessor and in the reign of William the Conqueror; and whenever a question arises as to the particular lands being *ancient demesne*, it is to be decided by the production of Domesday Book; wherein the lands which were in the possession of King Edward are called *terræ regis Edwardi*, and those which were in the possession of William the Conqueror are called *terræ regis*."

'Now, supposing a dispute arose at the present day as to whether Nympsfield were ancient demesne or not, it is a matter for consideration how far our courts would allow the statements in this monastic chronicle to influence their decision. I am quite aware of the doctrine that there can be no appeal from Domesday Book, and no averment made against it, but is this rule never to admit of qualification or relaxation?

'If the averment be supported strongly by collateral evidence, I see no reason why Domesday may not receive correction; it is a valuable record, but it is not infallible.'

APPENDIX B.

DXCVIII. De eodem (Stanedis).

Willelmus, rex Anglorum, Wlstando episcopo Wygorniaë, et W[illelmo] filio Osberni, et omnibus baronibus et ministris suis de Gloucestria et de Wyrecestresyra, Salutem, Sciatis me concessisse et reddidisse, atque confirmasse, Deo, et Sancto Petro de Gloucestria,

et *Serloni abbati*, et monachis ejusdem ecclesiæ, omnes terras quas Thomas Archiepiscopus Eboracensis injuste tenebat,¹ scilicet, Leecha, Ottintone, Stanedis, &c.

Testibus Lanfranco Archiepiscopo, Galfrido episcopo de Constantia, et Roberto Comite de Moretane.

APPENDIX C.

CONFIRMATION OF WILLIAM THE CONQUEROR. CARTULARIUM
S. PETR. GLOUC. f. 85^b, vol. i. p. 334.

Anno Incarnationis Domini millesimo octogesimo sexto, ego Willelmus rex Anglorum, petitione Serlonis Abbatis de Gloucestria et quorundam optimatum meorum, concessi Deo et ecclesiæ Sancti Petri in Gloucestria, possidere terras quas Thomas Archiepiscopus tenuerat de eadem ecclesia, scilicet, Leeches ; Otindona ; Stanedis ; ecclesiam Sancti Cadoci cum terra quam Robertus filius Hamonis dedit eidem Abbatæ ; scilicet et in Hamptesyra unam terram quam Hugo de Porth in suo obitu monachus effectus ipsi ecclesiæ dedit et vocatur Luttletone ; similiter et terram Plumtrey in Devensyre quam Odo filius Hamelini pro anima sua ibi traddidit ; terram etiam quæ vocatur *Clehangra* in Gloucestresyra de dono *Rogeri de Berkeley* pro animâ suâ et parentum suorum ; et in Herefordsira unam hidam de Roberto Curto ; et aliam de Willelmo de Ebroycis ; et in eadem syra in Erchenfelde unam terram Westwode vocatam quam dederat Walterius de Gloucestria ipsi ecclesiæ pro animâ patris sui ; et item in Gloucestresyra quandam terrulam quam Geri de Loges cum sua uxore dedit Sancto Petro in Getinges ; scilicet et molendinum de Framilade quem reddidit Abbati Wynebald de Baledon ; et item in Gloucestresyra Clifforde de dono Rogerii de Buseleye ; et item terram quæ vocatur Rudeforde *ex dono meo*, item Rudelai de dono Radulfi Bloyet ; ecclesiam quoque de Hadrop cum decima et terra presbiteri et ibi unum molendinum cum terra pertinente : alteram etiam ecclesiam Kynemereforde cum decima et terra sacerdotis, has [quas?] dederat ipsi [ecclesiæ] Ernulfus de

¹ As Thomas only became Archbishop of York in 1070, the statement that 'he used to hold' these lands, is almost enough to show that this charter, if authentic, was not granted till a considerably later period. Lanfranc was made Archbishop of Canterbury in the same year 1070.

Hesding ; scilicet et dimidiam hydam in Omenay quam Thovi *de me tenebat in elemosinam* ; decimam etiam de Cestertone de dono Nigelli de Oilly ; et quandam partem silvæ cum tribus bordariis de dono Elyæ Giffardi. Hiis testibus.

DISCUSSION.

MR. J. HORACE ROUND, having expressed his entire agreement with Sir Henry Barkly's vindication of the Survey, laid stress on the fatal contradiction between the story as told on p. 72 and on p. 101, the alleged culprit being Roger de Berkeley 'junior' in this former version, but his predecessor Roger de Berkeley 'senior' in the latter. Observing that William's alleged charter purported to confirm the estate to the Abbey, as it had been held before the Conquest, he contended that the 'III manentes' which Sir Henry had rendered 'tenements' were certainly intended to represent the 'III hidæ' of Domesday, 'manens' being found in such charters for 'hidæ.' As to the view that the whole story was a concoction of the fifteenth century, rather than derived from some earlier documents, he thought there was internal evidence to the contrary in the use of the remarkable phrase, 'descriptio totius Angliæ,' which would seem to have been only applied to Domesday at the time of its compilation and for a short while afterwards. This certainly looked to him as if the story was based on some much earlier document. In that case the expression 'abbate Serlone nesciente' might become of some interest, as bearing on the manner in which the Survey was, or was believed to have been made.

The Materials for the Reediting of the Domesday Book.

AND SUGGESTIONS FOR THE FORMATION OF A
DOMESDAY BOOK SOCIETY.

BY W. DE G. BIRCH, F.S.A.

THE extensive popular interest in the Domesday Book, of which we are now engaged in commemorating the eight hundredth anniversary, will, I trust, long survive the present series of meetings and exhibitions, highly instructive as they have been. Among the benefits which commemorations such as this confer upon the community, I think the two greatest are, first, that we are enabled by the kindness of custodians and public authorities to inspect valuable historical relics which have been arranged with special intention of educating us, and of which we should know little—and that little could only be learned with the cost of great pains and trouble—were it not for reunions such as these; secondly, our ideas are attracted towards subjects of which we never rightly estimate the interest until they are forced upon our attention, and we increase in ardour and admiration for them in proportion as their charms are unfolded to us. It will perhaps be a matter of surprise to some among us that the papers and discussions which have hitherto been heard, have been confined almost entirely to the statistical contents and the arith-

metical calculations of the Domesday Book, and but very little has been brought forward relating to the national, historical, and biographical aspects which it presents. This is to be regretted, because after all it is, to my mind, unprofitable to enquire the exact dimensions which conflicting critics would assign to a hide, an acre, or carucate, to the neglect of entries which strike down deeply into the history of our country, such as the causes which blended the British or Celtic, the Danish or Saxon, and the Norman elements into the one homogeneous Englishman of the present day. These influences are written in Domesday plainly, but between the lines, and have yet to be defined and illustrated before they can be fully understood.

In the spring of last year I had the honour of suggesting in the columns of the *Athenæum* the formation of a Domesday Book Society, the members of which would be enabled to possess by degrees, as published, a handy and uniform series of Domesday literature, both texts and essays, and I propose on this occasion to show, with your permission and as briefly as may be, of what kind and quality the materials are that are ready to hand for the work of the proposed Society, if my suggestion should find favour with a number of adherents sufficient to warrant its establishment.

I. First among MSS. of value for collation must be taken into consideration the pre-Domesday manuscripts, and here we must take cognisance of the *Inquisitio Comitatus Cantabrigiæ*, the 'Inquest of Cambridgeshire,' published in 1876 by Mr. N. E. S. A. Hamilton, then of the British Museum, under the auspices of the Royal Society of Literature. This is the original return made by the *juratores* of the county of Cambridge in obedience to the king's mandate, from which the Exchequer Domesday for that county was afterwards compiled by the royal secretaries. 'It is much,' says Hamilton, 'to be regretted that the only MS.' (British Museum, MS.

Cotton., Tiberius A. vi., which we were enabled by the kindness of the authorities of the British Museum to inspect) 'in which this important document is known to exist, has been injured by time and neglect, and above all, has lost several of its leaves. The Return is consequently defective at the end.' The greater part, however, has come down to us, and the text, printed by the above-mentioned editor for the first time, and side by side with the corresponding entries extracted from the Exchequer Domesday (to which I shall direct your attention presently), contains abundant evidence that we have in this Cottonian MS. the original source from which the Exchequer Domesday for that county was derived. 'It is singular,' continues Hamilton, 'that so important a document should have been extant only in a solitary MS., unpublished, and exposed in consequence to many risks of being lost or destroyed. Doubtless, numerous historical and literary treasures still exist among our ancient MSS. which are unknown to students and antiquaries. But in regard to this particular MS. the strange part is that from the days of Selden to those of Ellis—that is for a period of about 250 years—its existence had been known and its importance as elucidating Domesday history understood, and, in part at least, acknowledged.' Even the indefatigable Sir Thomas Duffus Hardy, late Deputy Keeper of the Public Records, has omitted all notice of this MS. in his account of the Exchequer Domesday Book, the *Inquisitio Eliensis*, and the Exon Domesday, in his 'Catalogue of British History,' vol. ii. Thus Hamilton, though not pretending to have discovered this important fragment, was the first to bring its importance to light, and to give it to the learned world. It is doubtful if any previous student of Domesday had distinguished the essential difference between the *Inquisitio Comitatus Cantabrigiensis*, or 'Inquest of Cambridgeshire,' and the comparatively far less important *Inquisitio Eliensis*, or 'Inquest of the Lands of the Monastery at Ely,' a mere record

of the landed property belonging to the monks of Ely, described therein as the lands of St. Æðelðryð, the founder of the nunnery of Ely in the seventh century, which latter had been quoted over and over again, and printed in the folio Commission edition of 1816, vol. iii. ; while the still more valuable portion containing the description of the lay as well as the ecclesiastical lands, in the shape of a copy of the original Domesday return as made by the *juratores* on the Conqueror's order, had been overlooked by everyone, although it occupies the folios adjacent to the 'Inquisitio Eliensis' in the Cotton MS. already mentioned. Selden in 1596, Gale in 1722, Philip Carteret Webb, 1756, and R. Kelham, 1788, all well known and conscientious writers on the Domesday, appear to have been strangely ignorant of the true nature of this MS. ; and the illustrious author and antiquary, Sir Henry Ellis, whose indispensable *Introduction to Domesday Book*,¹ and folio edition of the *Indices* to the Exchequer Domesday for the Record Commission, and *Additamenta*, forming vols. iii. and iv. of the Record edition, and published in 1816, connect his name for ever with the great work of William the Conqueror, incredible as it may seem, merely prints that portion of the MS. which relates to the monastic lands of Ely, and omits, without even reference or mention, the most valuable portion Mr. Hamilton gave to the world.²

Even Mr. S. Moore, a writer on the Domesday, criticising in the *Athenæum* of April 25, 1885, my proposed Society and remarks previously made by me on Domesday MSS., failed to distinguish these differences.

The manuscript from which Hamilton's text is taken, and which, so far as is still known, is the only remaining

¹ In 2 vols., 1833, 8vo (now ripe for revision and republication, notwithstanding the inability of Canon Taylor to accept some portions of it).

² Ellis knew of the MS. (see his own copy of Webb, with annotations on interleaved pages, in possession of his grandson, Mr. H. J. Ellis, of the British Museum).

exemplar, is numbered Tiberius A. vi. among the Cottonian MSS. in the British Museum. Its contents are: 1. A copy of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, to the year 977. 2. A memorandum entitled 'De portione crucis reperta a Sergio Papa,' etc. 3. 'Nomina Paparum qui miserunt pallium archiepiscopis Cantuariensibus ab Augustino ad Anselmum.' 4. 'The Inquisitio Eliensis.' 5. The Inquisition of Cambridgeshire. 6. A collection of charters and early documents relating to the monastery at Ely; and 7. A chronicle of England from Hardacnut to the 20th year of Edward III. in French.

The Inquisition of Cambridgeshire is contained between folios 76 and 113, one folio being lost between 111 and 112. It is written on vellum in double columns, thirty-one lines to a page, and in a fine bold hand of the concluding years of the twelfth century, perhaps about A.D. 1180. It is ornamented with capital letters in blue and red colours, and had occasionally floriated initials. The facsimile of the first folio, here exhibited, containing the Inquisition (f. 76), is a faithful reproduction of the manuscript page. The Ely Inquisition is in the same manuscript and in the same handwriting, but has been placed out of its order (by those who arranged the MS. for binding), before the Cambridge Inquisition. It will be found in folios 38-70.

This work should form an integral part of the publications of the new Society if copyright were not thereby infringed. It would form a portion, naturally, of the volume containing the Cambridgeshire Domesday, and I feel sure that Mr. Hamilton would cooperate with the Society in the work on this county. This contribution made by Hamilton to Domesday literature constitutes, as he truly says, a real contribution to historical knowledge, and he proceeds to give numerous examples showing how the facts recorded in the Domesday Book have been therein abridged or extended, sometimes imperfectly, from the original return.

II. *The Exon Domesday*, the second member of the Domesday trilogy, is so called because it belongs to the Cathedral Library of Exeter. The Dean and Chapter have with great kindness lent the MS. to the British Museum authorities, and we all had the opportunity of examining it when that institution was visited. The MS.¹ resembles the Cambridgeshire Inquest inasmuch as it contains an exact transcript of the original returns made by the Royal Commissioners of William the Conqueror, and from which the Exchequer Domesday, or *Liber Censualis*, was compiled or abridged. One important fact with regard to the MS. is the near approach which it makes to Domesday Book in its general form and palæography. There are (in like manner as has been described in the account of the Cambridgeshire Inquest) many variations between the Exeter and the Exchequer MSS., the chief of which, according to Hardy, are as follows:—

1. The Exeter MS. furnishes more detailed information than the Exchequer volume, which is especially apparent in the enumeration of the live stock on the several estates.

2. There is a marked difference in the diction of the two MSS., even where they agree in sense.

3. The variation in the spelling of proper names is remarkable. In the Exeter MS. the names of places have almost invariably a Latin termination, which is not usual in the Exchequer Book; and the names of persons frequently differ, though not to the same extent as those of places.

4. The names of the tenants in the time of Edward the Confessor are more numerous preserved in the Exeter than in the Exchequer Domesday.

This Exon Domesday is unfortunately confined to a description of the south-western parts of the kingdom, comprising the five counties of Wilts, Dorset, Somerset, Devon, and Cornwall (one of the *groups of counties* into which the Domesday

¹ There are some useful notices of this MS. in MS. Lansd. 320.

Return seems to have fallen). It is a small folio MS. of the eleventh century, consisting of 532 folios, and appears to have been the work of at least three, probably more, different scribes, and at various times,—a fact made evident by the variation in the mode of making the marks of abbreviations, and more particularly in the contraction of the word *et*. It was printed for the Commissioners on Public Records, under the editorship of Sir Henry Ellis, in 1816. But nevertheless the text of this MS. furnishes abundant material for future editors of the counties over which it extends, and the mere publication in parallel columns of the Domesday Book and the Exon Domesday would enable readers to glean a great deal of education and enlightenment in the prosecution of their Domesday studies.

III. *The Domesday Book* itself, that is, the Exchequer Domesday Book, now preserved in the Public Record Office at Fetter Lane, where it was inspected (side by side with numerous other MSS. which illustrate its many aspects) on the opening day of the Commemoration by the kindness of the authorities of the Record Office, is the central light of the subject. It is a vellum folio of the eleventh century, the first volume being larger than the second. The whole of the MS. was printed, in the last century, in consequence of an address by the House of Lords to the King in 1767. This great and expensive work was commenced in 1772, and the two volumes folio of which it consists were completed in 1783. It is now scarce, and fetches a considerable price. Sir Henry Ellis, as I have already stated, printed two more volumes (iii. and iv.) containing indices and supplementary pieces. Portions of the Domesday Book have been printed, as I shall presently show, in almost every county history; and a complete facsimile has been made by means of photo-zincography,—a process eminently and notoriously ill adapted to the faithful reproduction of ancient MSS. (because of the artificial manipulation required to complete the work),—under the direction of

Colonel Sir Henry James, F.R.S., of the Ordnance Survey at Southampton A.D. 1861-3. The price of this production is 18/.

The work of Domesday was commenced about A.D. 1084 (the exact time being unknown, and variously stated). It was finished in 1086. As soon as each 'Inquisition' was completed it was forwarded to Winchester, where, after being abstracted, all 'Inquisitions' were digested into one body; and thus was formed the existing transcript. That this is fuller in some places than others is no doubt owing to the fact that this same difference characterised the original returns, and also to the fact that some of the scribes who drew up the final state of the work were more strongly actuated by the desire of brevity than others. The very character of the handwriting, technically called 'set minuscules,' has been said to bear but little resemblance to either the book-hand or the Chancery charter-hand of the period, and with great probability may have been introduced by some of the foreign ecclesiastics of the Conqueror's court. The writing has been thought by some to resemble an Italian hand; and if the conjecture be correct, that the scribes were indeed of that country, it is possible that Lanfranc, the Lombard Archbishop of Canterbury, whom William of Malmesbury calls '*litteratura per-insignis*,' had supervision of the work.

We learn from the copy of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle preserved among Archbishop Laud's MSS. in the Bodleian Library at Oxford (which contains later historical notices than the other copies in the British Museum), under the year 1085, the following particulars of the manner in which Domesday originated:—A.D. 1085. 'Then, at midwinter, the King was at Gloucester with his *witan*, and there held his court five days, and afterwards the Archbishop and clergy had a synod three days. After this, the King had a great council, and very deep speech with his *witan* about

this land, how it was peopled, or by what men. Then sent he his men over all England, into every shire, and caused to be ascertained how many hundred hides were in the shire, or what land the King himself had, and cattle within the land, or what dues he ought to have in twelve months from the shire. Also he caused to be written how much land his archbishops had, and his suffragan bishops, and his abbots, and his earls; and—though I may narrate somewhat prolixly—what or how much each man had, who was a holder of land in England,—in land or in cattle, and how much money it might be worth. So very narrowly he caused it to be traced out that there was not one single hide, nor one ‘yard’ (virgate) of land, nor even—it is shame to tell, though it seemed to him no shame to do—an ox, nor a cow, nor a swine, was left that was not set down in his writ. And all the writings were brought to him afterwards.’¹

And again, under A.D. 1087, the same Chronicle relates: ‘He (William) reigned over England, and by his sagacity so thoroughly surveyed it that there was not a hide of land within England that he knew not who had it, or what it was worth, and afterwards set it in his writ.’²

Its compilation then, as we gather,³ was determined on at Gloucester by the King in council, in order that he might know what was due to *him* in the shape of taxes from every subject, and that they, in their turn, might know what each had to pay. Thus it was calculated to be as much for the protection of the subject as for the benefit of the sovereign. The nobles and the people had been, as we know, grievously distressed by the immigration, under royal auspices, of large numbers of French and Bretons, who were, so to speak, billeted on the natives according to the extent of their land, ostensibly for the purpose of resisting the apprehended Danish invasion.

¹ Thorpe's Translation for the Master of the Rolls.

² *Ibid.* This is not strictly correct.

³ Hardy, *Cat.* ii. 34.

The commissioners appointed to take the survey were to inquire into the numerous points which I had intended to read, but they were detailed by Mr. Moore in his paper the other evening :—1, the name of the place ; 2, who held it in the time of King Edward the Confessor ; 3, the present possessor ; 4, of how many hides the manor consisted ; 5, how many ploughs there were in the demesne ; 6, how many homagers ; 7, how many villeins ; 8, how many cottars ; 9, how many serving-men ; 10, how many free tenants ; 11, how many tenants in socage ; 12, how much wood, meadow, and pasture there was ; 13, the number of mills and fish-ponds ; 14, what had been added to or taken away from the place ; 15, the gross value in the time of King Edward (returned as ‘T.R.E.,’ or ‘quando rex Edwardus fuit vivus et mortuus’) ; 16, the present value ; 17, how much each freeman or socman had or has, and whether any advance can be made in the value.

Thus it could be ascertained who held any specified estate in the time of King Edward the Confessor, who then held it, what was the value in the time of the late King, and the value at the moment of taking the particulars. To the minuteness of this survey the concluding portion of the translated extracts given above bears sadly graphic testimony.

It has not yet been satisfactorily explained why many districts were left unnoticed in the great survey which was manifestly intended to embrace the whole territory of England. The four important and extensive northern English counties of Northumberland, Cumberland, Westmoreland, and Durham, are not described in the survey. Possibly these counties were not in a satisfactorily settled condition to enable the emissaries of the King to visit the ground they were to report upon.¹ We know that in 1080, only a few

¹ I am also reminded by a correspondent that : ‘As to the English counties of Northumberland, Cumberland, Westmoreland, and Durham, the fact is, that the undescribed district comprised the Earldoms of Northumberland and Cumber-

years before the commencement was made, the King had desolated the province of Durham, which was just beginning to recover from the baneful and destructive effects of a foreign invasion. The murder of Walkere, Bishop of Durham, in May of that year, it is related, 'occasionem dedit regi ut provintiæ illius reliquias, quæ aliquantulum respiraverant, funditus exterminaret.'¹ Lancashire does not appear under its proper name; but Furness and the northern parts of the county, as well as the south of Westmoreland, with a part of Cumberland, are included within the West Riding of Yorkshire. That portion of Lancashire which lies between the Ribble and the Mersey, and which at the time of the surveys comprehended 688 manors, is subjoined to Cheshire; and part of the county of Rutland is described in the account of the counties of Northampton and Lincoln.

Sir Thomas D. Hardy does not speak very enthusiastically of the historical value of Domesday Book. He says, 'Very few historical occurrences or illustrations of ancient manners are noticed in the Survey. Those which occur have been collected by Sir Henry Ellis in his "General Introduction to Domesday Book."'² This copy is in two volumes. Vol. I contains the survey of thirty shires: that is to say of all that were surveyed except Essex, Norfolk, and Suffolk, the fuller reports of which are contained in a second volume. This consists of 382 leaves, vellum, measuring 14 $\frac{5}{8}$ by 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ inches. It is written in double columns. The arrangement is in quires, generally of eight leaves ruled on one side, with double vertical lines bounding the columns. The writing is in 'set minuscules,' with frequent changes of hand. Running titles and headings are in red.

land, both dependencies of the English Crown, but neither of them merged in the general polity of England, whose kings did not interfere with the internal concerns of either province.' *The Pipe Rolls of Cumberland, Westmoreland, and Durham*. Newcastle, 1847. Introduction, p. iv.

¹ Will. Malm. *Gesta Pontificum*, p. 271.

² *Cat. Brit. Hist.* ii. 35.

Vol. 2 contains the full reports for the counties of Essex, Norfolk, and Suffolk. This contains 450 leaves, vellum, measuring $10\frac{5}{8}$ by $7\frac{5}{8}$ ins. At the end is the following memorandum, 'Anno Millesimo Octogesimo sexto ab incarnatione domini, vigesimo vero regni Willelmi facta est ista descriptio non solum per hos tres comitatus, sed etiam per alios.' The arrangement is in quires, generally of eight leaves ruled on one side; some of the sheets being remnants without corners, or otherwise defective. The writing is in 'set minuscules,' with frequent change of hand. Running titles are in red, and the initial letters are filled with patches of red.

IV. There is a nicely written fragment containing part of the Domesday Survey for the county of Kent in the British Museum, Cotton. MS. Vitellius, C. viii. ff. 143-156. It was exhibited to us the other day in the King's Library of the British Museum. This was probably at first carried about in a pocket, for it is worn in places, and has a few deficiencies. It was a roll, and is now cut up and inlaid into fourteen leaves. It is in a handwriting of the twelfth century, and written, as rolls should be, only on one side of the page. The text agrees pretty closely with that of the Exchequer Domesday, but is deserving of a careful collation by the editors of a Kent Domesday Book for the Society.

Of the late paper copies and manuscript extracts of Domesday Book in the British Museum and other places of deposit, I do not propose to say anything in this paper, but there are several unpublished documents of the highest importance, contemporary with the period of the Domesday Book, among the British Museum Manuscripts. This is clear from the fact that only just recently an original record of the plea, or suit tried at Penenden Heath about the year 1070, whereat Archbishop Lanfranc recovered (by process of the ancient popular court of the Anglo-Saxon Witenagemot, with

special permission of the King then held *pro hac vice*) numerous lands in Kent which had been unjustly detained by Odo, the powerful Bishop of Bayeux, from the Cathedral Church of Canterbury. I think the reader of the previous paper had no knowledge of this document, but I should be happy to show it to him at any time. The Chronicler Eadmer of Canterbury, and others, have given notices of this great suit, and William of Malmesbury points out its beneficial result on the condition of the Church in England. The document is still unpublished, but I hope to print it in the course of a few days, and with others that will come to light to reward patient searchers, now that public attention has been directed to the Domesday Book, and interest stimulated, it will form valuable illustrations of the Domesday in the hands of commentators and editors. Similar in many respects to the foregoing is the Worcester lawsuit between Bishop Wlstan and the Abbot of Evesham, of which a record exists in the Chartulary compiled by the monk Heming for the Bishop, British Museum, Cottonian Library, Tiberius, A. xiii. It has been printed in the old days by the indefatigable antiquary Hearne, but, as Mr. Round recently showed, has escaped the notice of a modern professor. These are two examples out of many to indicate the need of annotating Domesday Book more fully than it has been treated heretofore.

A very fertile class of documents which have been hitherto much neglected by Domesday students is that of the ANGLO-SAXON CHARTERS. These charters, or grants of land, are in a large proportion of instances accompanied by a perambulation or description of the boundaries of the land conveyed by the grantor, generally the king in his public capacity as head of the state, to a lay or ecclesiastical corporation or to an individual. The paragraphs containing the boundaries are written in Anglo-Saxon, notwithstanding that the body of the deed is written in Latin. They form a species of survey, although inexact and not

so precise perhaps in point of plotting as a modern surveyor would desire, yet suited to the remote antiquity of the time when land was not valued for its extent so much as for the capabilities it possessed for sustentation of a family, naturally a variable number of persons, and equally naturally varying in proportion to the excellence of its position and the fertility of its soil. These boundaries I recommend to future Domesday Book editors as affording material of considerable value in connection with the Domesday Record of many estates. In most instances the notices of places which are given* in the Anglo-Saxon Charters are the oldest strictly topographical notices which we are able to obtain, hence the need of comparing the evidence they present with the comparatively more recent Domesday Book evidence of from three hundred and fifty years less remoteness.

The value of the Anglo-Saxon Charters, of which there are about two thousand extant, and more than half this number with boundaries and topographical notices, has hitherto been underrated by those who have studied the statistical and geodesical aspects of the Domesday Book. These boundaries afford evidence of such a character as to compel us to modify very materially the pleasant theories of Canon Taylor, who would have it that agriculture was in rectangular plots, with slightly S-shaped bounding lines, whereas it is far more natural to assume that the area cultivated was of irregular dimensions, regulated by convenience, proximity to dwellings, the natural course of streams and rivers and other obstacles, the cropping up of sterile strata, and the stubbornness of forests to yield to the first efforts of the pioneer. The extensive number of points along which the boundaries ran is clear proof against the rectilinear and right-angle theory. I would also say here that the Charters possess extremely little evidence in favour of 'common-field' co-operative system, two-shift, three-shift, or any other kind of agriculture except that of absolute

possession by way of three-lived, four-lived, or of freehold, possession, and it is impossible to concede that the Norman occupation of the land suddenly changed the universal method current in Saxon time, which must have been independent of the rule Canon Taylor lays down, and rather governed by the local exigencies and peculiarities bound to be taken into account. Some of the Anglo-Saxon Wills contain notices of rent in kind which cannot fail to be of interest. The recent discovery¹ of a Saxon Survey taken of the districts or territories of England in the days before Alfred, or the 8th century at latest, indicates that even in that remote date, 400 years before Domesday Book, the arability of the land had been estimated in round numbers, but whether with a view to taxation, or as a comparative tabulation of military strength, we cannot yet determine. Probably both objects were served by the taking of the Survey. This MS., which was exhibited at the British Museum, shows that the Domesday Survey was no new thing to which the inhabitants of England were then subjected for the first time.

Contemporary drawings and illuminations must not be overlooked, for the explanation they afford of Domesday manners and customs is great. At the British Museum, for example, we saw four Anglo-Saxon MSS. with the operation of ploughing depicted in such a manner as to compel us to receive with considerable hesitation Canon Taylor's theory of eight oxen yoked to a very large plough worked on the co-operative system, for contemporary pictures in MSS. tell us there were two, or at most four oxen, to a diminutive plough. Most ancient tools, indeed, were puerile; the granite colossi of Egypt were worked, as is known, with copper or bronze tools as weak, and apparently as inefficient, as the contents of a schoolboy's toolbox would be, to a modern cabinet-maker. We may see an

¹ See the List of MSS. exhibited at the British Museum to the Commemoration, No. I (post p. 651).

Egyptian carpenter's tool-bag figured in Wilkinson's *Egypt*, and their seeming uselessness strikes us at once. Hence, and from the few extant implements of the Domesday period, we may assume that agricultural implements in Domesday Book period were small and comparatively weak. Human muscle in the old days everywhere did the greater part of the work.

ABRIDGED DOMESDAY.

There are three abridged copies of the Exchequer Domesday Book :—

1. Record Office, formerly in Chapter House, for the use of the Chamberlains of the Exchequer.
2. Record Office, formerly in the Office of the King's Remembrancer, for the use of the Treasurers, and afterwards in the custody of the Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer.

3. British Museum, Arundel MS. 153.

1. This is a folio volume, well written, and of beautiful appearance, with some spirited initial letters and illuminations. It is reputed to be of the time of Edward I., and agrees completely in respect of arrangement, and almost *verbatim et literatim* with the second MS. (of which I have been fortunately able to obtain a very detailed account), and from which this was most probably compiled. The two MSS. are evidently not of coeval creation, although the writing of both is somewhat homogeneous. In the fly-leaf of this MS. is an absurd memorandum of Peter le Neve, Norroy King of Arms, and one of the Vice-Chamberlains of Queen Anne's Exchequer, stating his opinion that the MS. was written and illuminated in the time of Henry VII. Sir Henry Ellis appears to have been unaware of the existence of this MS.

2. The *Breviate*, a copy of the Domesday Book in the Office of the Remembrancer of the Exchequer. The following is mainly derived from an account in a *Catalogue of Records*

remaining in the office of the King's Remembrancer of the Exchequer by an official hand :—

DOMESDAY BOOK.

The earliest Record as regards subject-matter, though perhaps not compilation, removed from the King's Remembrancer Office to the Record Office, is that which forms the greater portion of a volume passing under the denomination of DOMESDAY BOOK. It is a small folio volume, in the original oak binding with bosses. By comparison with the printed copy of the Domesday Book in the Public Record Office, and the Exon Domesday, the Record in question appears to be a *very partial abridgment*. In this abstract the villani, bordarii, and stock are omitted. The object for which it was compiled for the use of the Treasurer of the Exchequer is not apparent, and it cannot be stated with certainty to what extent the abridgment is carried until a precise investigation has been made between the several Records, yet some idea of the variations may be gained from the following extracts. The incipient sentences of each volume are taken, and the corresponding portions of the Exchequer Domesday underlined.

Domesday of the Remembrancer's Office.

KENT.—Terra Regis. Tempore Regis Edwardi Burgenses Doverē invenerūt . xx^{ti}. naves Regi una vice in anno ad . xv. dies 7 ī unaq^aq^{ue} navi erant homines . xx^{ti}. 7 un^o. Hoc faciebant p^{ro} eo qđ eis pdonaverat sacam 7 socam. Q^uando Missatici Regis veniebant ibi : dabāt p^{ro} Caballo t^{ra}nsducendo . iii . deñ in hieme 7 duos in estate. Burgenses v^o inveniebāt Stiremannū 7 unū aliū adjutorem. Et si plus op^{us} ēēt : de peccunia ej^{us} conducebat^r.

In dimidio lest de Sudona in Athestani hundred. Rex Wilf^{elm} teñ Tarentefort . p^{ro} uno solino 7 dimidio se defendit. De hoc mañio tenet Hugo de Port dimiđ solīn in Hagelei.

In lest de Flesford in Laverochesfeld hund. Elefford p uno soliñ.

In diñ lest de Mideltune in Middeltune hund. Middeltune p q^{ater}. xx^{ti}. soliñ se defend. Extra hos' sunt i dominio. III. soliñ. Dehoc m̄. teñ Hugo de Port. VIII soł 7. i. jugū.

In lest de Wiwarlet in Faveresham hund' Favereshant. p. VII. soł se defendit.'

Exchequer Domesday.

CHENTH.—Dovere Tēpore regis Edwardi reddebat. XVIII. libras. de quibus denariis habebat rex. E. duas partes 7 comes Goduin^o terciā. Contra hoc habebant canonici de s̄co Martino medietatē aliam. Burgenses deder. xx^{ti}. naues | ^{regi} una uice in anno ad. xv. dies. 7 in una quaq, nauī erant hōes. xx^{ti} 7 un^o. Hoc faciebant pro eo qđ eis pdonauerat saccā 7 socā. Quando missatici regis ueniebant ibi' dabant pro caballo transducendo. III^{es}. denarios in hieme. 7 II^{es}. in estate. Burgenses u^o inueniebāñ stiremannū 7 unū aliū adjutorē. 7 si plus opus. ēē' de pecunia ej^o conducebat'. ¶ A festiuitate S' Michaelis usq, ad festū S̄ci Andreae'. . . . [Five columns omitted before the relative portions appear in the copy of the Remembrancer's Office.]

Terra Regis. In Dimidio Lest de Svdtone. In Achestan Hđ.—. I. Rex Willelmvs teñ Tarentefort. p uno solino 7 dimidio se defđ. T'ra. ē. XL. caruċ. In dñio sunt. II. cař. 7 CXLII. uiffi cū. X. bord hāt. LIII. cař. Ibi sunt. III. serui. 7 I. mold. p^{ati}. XX. II. acræ. pasturæ. XL. aċ. De silua. VIII. denæ paruæ. 7 III. magnæ. Ibi. II. hedæ. id est. II^o. port^o.

T. R. E: ualuit. LX. liċ. 7 tñtđ qđo ^{uicec'} haimo recepit. Modo ap̄ciat' ab anglis. LX. liċ. P'posit^o u^o franciġ qui teñ ad firmā. dicit q^a uat q^{at} xx^{ti}. liċ. 7 X. liċ. Ipse tam reddit de isto m̄. LXX. liċ pensatas. 7 CXL. solid de deñ. xx^{ti}. in ora. 7 VII. liċ 7 XXVI. deñ ad numeř. Sup hæc reddit uice~. C. soł. Homines de Hund testificant'. qđ de isto m̄ regis ablatū. ē unū p^{atū}. 7 uñ alnetū. 7 uñ mold. 7 xx^{ti}. acræ

fræ . 7 adhuc tant^r p^ati quantū ptiñ ad . x. ac^as fræ . quæ oīa
erañ in firma regis . E. dū uiueret . h̄ uaf . xx^{ti}. soł. Dicunt
auř qđ Osuuard tē uicecom̄ præstitit ea Alestan pposito Lundoñ.

7 m^o teñ helt^o dapifer 7 nepos. ^{uej'} Testant^r quoq, qđ Hagelei
de isto ṡ ablata . ẽ . quæ se defđ p diñ soliñ. Hanc frā
tenebat uicecom̄ . 7 qđo uicecomitatū amittebat^r in firma
regis remaneb̄. Ita pmansit 7 post mortē R. E. Modo teñ
Hugo de port. cū . L.III. acris fræ plus . Totū hoc uaf . xv.
lib. ¶ De eođ ṡ regis adhuc sunt ablatae . VI. acrae fræ . 7
quædā silua quā isđ Osuuard^o posuit ext^a ṡ . p qđdā uadimoñ .
XL. solidoz. ¶ Æcc̄lam huj^o ṡ teñ eṡs de Rouecestre . 7
uaf LX. soł. Extra hanc suñ adhuc ibi . III. æcclesiola.

In Lest de Elesford. In Lavrochesfel Hvnd̄.—Rex W.
teñ Elesford . p uno soliñ se defđ. T'ra ẽ . xv. cař. In dñio
sunt . III. cař . 7 XL. uiffi cū . v. bord̄ hñt . xv. cař . Ibi . VIII.
serui . 7 i. mold̄ . XL. deñ . 7 . XLIII. ac p^ati . Silua . LXX.
porē . Inñ toř ualeb̄ . T. R. E. xv. lib . 7 ĩntđ qđo haimo ^{uicec'}
recep̄ . m^o uaf . xx. lib . Tañ redd̄ . xxxi. lib . 7 uicec̄ inde
hñ III. lib̄. De hoc ṡ teñ Ansgot^o juxta rouecestre tantū
fræ . qđ ap̄ciat^r . VII. lib . Eṡs etiā de Rouecest̄ p excābio ĩre
in qua castellū sedet . tantū de hac ĩra teñ . qđ . xvii^{te}. soł 7
III^{or}. deñ uaf.

In Lest de ^{dimidio} Middelvtne. In Middelvtñ Hund̄.—Rex . W.
teñ Middelvtne . p quaf xx^{ti}. solins se defđ. Extra hos^r sunt
in dñio III. solins . 7 ibi . III. cař in dñio. In hoc ṡ . CCC^{ti}.
7 IX. uiffi cū . LXXIII. bord̄ . hñt . CLX. VII. cař . Ibi sunt . VI.
mold̄ de . xxx. solid . 7 xviii^{to}. ac p^ati . Ibi . xxvii. salinae
de . xxvii. solidis . Ibi . xxxii. piscariae de . xxii. soł 7 VIII.
deñ . De theloneo XL. soł. De pastura . XIII. soł 7 III. deñ .
Silua . CC.XX. porē . 7 hōes de Walt reddunt . L. soł pro
Ineuuard̄ 7 Aueris. In hoc ṡ sunt . x. serui . Inñ totū . T. R. E.
naleb̄ CC. lib̄ ad numerū . 7 tñtđ qđo Haimo ^{uicecom'} recep̄ . 7 m^o
similiter. ¶ De hoc ṡ teñ hugo de port . VIII. solins 7 unū
jugū . qui T. R. E. erant cū alijs solins in ĩsuetudine. Ibi.

hř . III. cař in dñio. H' řra quā teñ Hugo de port . uař . XX. liř q^o cōputant^r in . CC^{ta}. liř toti^o Middeltn . qui teñ reddit . CXL. liř ad ignē et ad pensā . 7 insup . xv. liř 7 VI. soř . II. denař min^o ad numerū . Haimoni dat pposit^o . XII. liř . ¶ De silua regis hř Wadard^o tanř qđ reddē XVI. deñ p anñ . 7 dimidiā denā tenet quā T. R. E. q'dā uillan^o tenuit . 7 Alnod cild duas partes cuidā uillō p uim abstulit . ¶ Æccas 7 decimas huj^o M teñ abb S' Augustini . 7 XL. soř de . IIII. solins regis exeunt ei.

In Lest de Wiwarlet. In Favreshant Hvndē.—Rex W. teñ Favreshant . p VII. solins se defđ . T'ra . ē XVII. cař . In dñio sunt . II^o. Ibi . xxx. uillī cū . XL. bordē . hñt . XXI. cař . Ibi . v. serui . 7 I. moliñ de . XX. soř . 7 II^o. ac p^ati . Silua . c. porcē . 7 de pastura siluæ . XXXI. soř . 7 II. deñ . Mercatū . de . III. liř . 7 II^o. salinæ de . III. solidē 7 II. deñ . 7 in cantuař ciuitate . III^o. hagæ | ad hoc M ptiñ . In totis ualenř T. R. E. ualeb . LX. liř . v. solidē min^o . 7 post' LX. liř . Modo uař q^ater . XX^{ta} . liř .

Domesday of the Remembrancer's Office.

MIDDELSEX.—Terř S' Pet' Westmoñ. In Josulvestane hđ . i villa ubi sedet eccl'a Sđi Pet' teñ Abb ej^odem loci . XIII. hiđ 7 diñ . In eadem villa teñ Bernard^o . III. hiđ de Abbe . Hamstede teñ Abb Sđi Petri . p IIII hiđ . In eadē villa teñ Rannulf^o Pevrel de Abbe . i. hiđ . In Speletone hđ . Stanes teñ Abb p . XIX. hiđ . Suneberie p . VII. hiđ . Scepertone p . VIII. hiđ . In Helertone hđ . Greneforde p . XI. hiđ 7 diñ . Hanewelle p . VIII. hiđ . Covellie p . II. hiđ . In hundē de Gare . tenet Wills Camerari^o šb Abbe . II. hiđ 7 diñ in Chingesberie . Handone teñ Abb p . XX. hiđ . Hermodeswřde . teñ abb S' T'nitatis Rotomağ de Rege . p XXX. hiđ . In Speletorne hđ . i. hiđ .

Exchequer Domesday.

MIDELSEXE.—Terra Sđi Petri Westmoñ. In Osvlvestane hđ . M In Villa ubi sedet æcc'la S' Petri . tenet abb ej^odē

loci . XIII. hið 7 dið . T'ra ē ad XI. cař . Ad dñium ptiñ . IX. hidæ 7 I. uirg . 7 ibi suñ . IIII. cař . Viñi hñt . VI. cař . 7 I. cař plus poť fieri . Ibi . IX. uithi q'sq de . I. uirg . 7 I. uiths de . I. hida . 7 IX. uithi q'sq de dið uirg . 7 I. coť de . V. ač . 7 XL. I. coť q' reddt p anñ . XL. soť p ortis suis . P*ťu XI. cař . Past'ra ad pecuñ uillæ . Silua . C. porč . 7 XXV. dom^o militū abbis 7 alioz hōum . qui reddt VIII. soť p annū . In totis ualenť uať . X. lið . Q'do recep . similit . T. R. E. . ʹ XII. lið . Hoc ƿ fuit 7 est in dñio æcclæ S' Petri . Westmonasterij . In eađ uilla teñ Bainiard^o . III. hið de abbe . T'ra ē . ad . II. cař . 7 ibi suñ in dñio . 7 I. coť . Silua . C. porč . Past'ra ad pecuñ . Ibi . IIII. arpeni uineæ . nouit planť . In totis ualenť uať . LX. soť . Q'do recep . ʹ XX. soť T. R. E. VI. lið . H' ĩra jacuit 7 jacet in æcclā S' Petri . ƿ Hamestede teñ abb S' Petri . IIII. hið . T'ra . III. cař . Ad dñiū ptiñ . III. hið 7 dið . 7 ibi . ē . I. cař . Viñi hñt . I. cař . 7 alia poť fieri . Ibi . I. uith de . I. uirg . 7 V. bord de . I. uirg . 7 I. seru^o . Silua . C. porč . Inť totū uať . L. soť . Q'do recep . simit . T. R. E. . ʹ C. soť . In eađ uilla teñ Ranñ peurel sub abbe . I. hidā de ĩra uithoz . T'ra dið cař . 7 ibi est . H' ĩra ualuit 7 uať V. solid . Hoc ƿ totū simul jacuit 7 jacet in dñio æcclæ S' Petri .

In Speletorne Hvnd . ƿ Stanes teñ abb S' Petri p . XIX. hið . T'ra est ad XXIIII. cař . Ad dñiū ptiñ . XI. hidæ . 7 ibi sunt XIII. cař . Viñi hñt XI. cař . Ibi . III. uithi . q'sq dið h . 7 . IIII. uith de . I. h . 7 VIII^o . uith q'sq de dið uirg . 7 XXXVI. bord de . III. h . 7 I. uith . de . I. uirg . 7 IIII. bord de . XL. ač . 7 X. bord . q'sq . V. ač . 7 V. coť . q'sq . de . IIII. ač . 7 VIII. bord de . I. uirg . 7 III. coť de . IX. ač . 7 XII. serui . 7 XLVI. burg q' reddt p annū . XL. soť . Ibi . VI. molini de . LXIII. soť . 7 I. guort de . VI. soť . 7 VIII. deñ . 7 I. guort qđ nil redđ . Past'ra ad pecuñ uillæ . P*ťu . XXIIII. cař . 7 XX. soť de sup plus . Silua xxx. porč . 7 . II. arpeni uineæ . Ad hoc ƿ ptineñ IIII. bereuū . 7 ibi fueť . T. R. E. . In totis ualentis uať xxxv. lið . Q'do recep . simit . T. R. E. . ʹ XL. lið . Hoc ƿ jacuit 7 jacet in dñio æcclæ S' Petri . ƿ Svñeberie teñ abb S' Petri . p VII. hið . T'ra . VI. cař . ē ibi . Ad dñiū ptiñ . IIII. h . 7 I. cař ibi .

ē . Viſſi hñt . IIII. caſ . Ibi p̄br hñ diñ uirg̃ . 7 VIII. uiffi . q'ſq̃ .
 I. uirg̃ . 7 II. uiffi de . I. uirg̃ . 7 v. bord de . I. uirg̃ . 7 v. coſ .
 7 I. ſeru^o . p^atū . VI. caſ . Paſt'a ad pecuñ uillæ . In totis
 ualentijs ualet . VI. liſ . Q'do recep̃ . ſimiliſ . T. R. E . VII.
 liſ . Hoc ⁊ fuit 7 eſt in dñio æcclæ S' Petri. ⁊ Scepertone
 teñ abb S' Petri p . VIII. hið . T'ra ē ad . VII. caſ . Ad dñiū
 ptiñ . III. h̄ 7 diñ . 7 ibi eſt . I. caſ . uiffi hñt . VI. caſ . Ibi .
 XVII. uiffi q'ſq̃ . de . I. uirg̃ . P̄br . xv. ac^as . 7 III. coſ . de . IX.
 aē . 7 II. coſ 7 II. ſerui . p^atū . VII. ē . Paſt'a ad pecuñ uille .
 7 I. guort . de . VI. ſoſ 7 VIII. deñ . Inñ toſ uaſ . VI. liſ . ⁊ Q'do
 recep̃ . ſimiſ . T. R. E . VII. liſ . Hoc ⁊ fuit 7 . ē in dñio
 æcclæ S' Petri.

In Heletorne hvndret. ⁊ Greneforde teñ abb S' Petri .
 p XI. hið 7 diñ . T'ra . ē . VII. caſ . Ad dñiū ptiñ . v. hið . 7 I.
 caſ . ibi . ē . 7 alia potest fieri . Viſſi hñt . v. caſ . Ibi . I. uiffi
 hñ I. hið . 7 I. uirg̃ . 7 . IIII. uiffi q'ſq̃ de diñ hið . 7 IIII. uiffi
 de . I. hið . 7 VII. bord de . I. hið . Q'dā franē . I. hida 7 I.
 uirg̃ . 7 III. coſ 7 VI. ſerui . Silua . CCC. porē . Paſt'a ad pecuñ
 uillæ . In totis ualent̄ . uaſ VII. liſ . Q'do recep̃ . ſimiliſ .
 T. R. E . x. liſ . Hoc ⁊ jacuit 7 jacet in dñio æcclæ S' Petri.
 ⁊ Hanewelle teñ abb S' Petri . p VIII. hið . ſe defend . T'ra v.
 caſ . Ad dñiū ptiñ . IIII. h̄ 7 . I. uirg̃ . 7 I. caſ . ibi ē . Viſſi
 hñt . IIII. caſ . Ibi I. uiffi de . II. hið . 7 IIII. uiffi . de . I. hið
 7 VI. bord de . III. uirg̃ 7 IIII. coſ . 7 II. ſerui . Ibi . I. moliñ
 de . II. ſoſ 7 II. deñ . P^atū I. caſ . Silua . L. porē . In totis
 ualent̄ uaſ . C. 7 x. ſoſ . Q'do recep̃ . ſimiſ . T. R. E . VII. liſ .
 Hoc ⁊ fuit 7 . ē in dñio S' Petri. ⁊ Covelie . teñ abb S' Petri .
 p II. hið ſe defend . T'ra . ē . I. caſ . Ad dñiū ptiñ . I. hida 7
 diñ . 7 ibi . ē . I. caſ . Ibi . II. uiffi de diñ h̄ . 7 I. coſ . P^atū
 diñ caſ . Paſt'a ad peē uiffē . Silua . XL. porē 7 moliñ . de v.
 ſoſ . H' ſra uaſ . xxx. ſoſ . Q'do recep̃ . ſimiliſ . T. R. E . XL.
 ſoſ . Hanc ſrā tenuit 7 tenet in dñio S' Petr^o Westmoñ . In
 Hvnd de Gare . teñ Wiſſi camerari^o ſub abb S' Petri . II. hið
 7 diñ in Chingesberie . T'ra . II. caſ . In dñio . I. caſ . 7 uiffi
 I. caſ . Ibi v. uiffi q'ſq̃ de . I. uirg̃ . 7 I. coſ . Silua . CC. porē .
 H' ſra uaſ . xxx. ſoſ . Q'do recep̃ . ſimiliſ . T. R. E . LX. ſoſ .

Hanc ƿrā tenuit Aluuu² horne teign² regis . E. in uadimonio de q^odā hōe S' Petri. ƿ Handone . teñ abb S' Petri . p xx. hið se defendð . T'ra . xvi. cañ . Ad dñiū ptiñ . x. hide 7 ibi suñ . iii. cañ . Viñi hñt . viii. cañ 7 v⁴ adhuc posð fieri . Ibi pbr hñ . i. uirg . 7 iii. uifli q'sq diñ h 7 vii. uifli q'sq i. uirg . 7 xvi. uifli q'sq diñ uirg . 7 xii. bor q' teneñ diñ hið . 7 vi. coñ 7 i. seru² . P^atū . ii. boū . Silua . mille porc . 7 x. soñ . In totis ualent uaf . viii. lið . Q'do recep similið . T. R. E. xii. lið . Hoc ƿ jacuit 7 jacet in dñio ecclē S' Petri.

Terra S^cae Trinitatis De Monte Rotoñ. ƿ ^{Rotomag'} Hermodesworde . tenet abb S' Trinitatis de rege . p xxx. hið se defendð . T'ra . ē xx. cañ . Ad dñiū ptiñ . viii. hidæ . 7 ibi suñ . iii. cañ . Inñ franç 7 uiflos suñ x. cañ . 7 vii. adhuc posð . ēē . Ibi q'dā miles hñ . ii. hið . 7 ii. uifli q'sq . i. h 7 ii. uifli de . i. h . 7 xiiii. uifli q'sq de . i. uirg . 7 vi. uifli q'sq de diñ uirg . 7 vi. bord q'sq . v. ač . 7 vii. coñ 7 vi. serui . Ibi . iii. molini . de lx. soñ . 7 q'ngenñ anguiñ . 7 de piscinis . mille Anguillæ . P^atū . xx. cañ . Past'a ad pecuñ uillæ . Silua q'ngenñ porc 7 i. arpeñ uineæ . In totis ualent uaf . xx. lið . Q'do recep . xii. lið . T. R. E. xxv. lið . Hoc ƿ tenuit coñ Herald² . 7 in hoc ƿ fuit q'dā sochs teñ ii. hið de his . xxx. h . ñ potuit dare ð uendē ext^a hermodesworde . T. R. E. In Speletorne hvnd

^{S' Trinitatis} teñ Hertald² m^o de rege i. hið . T'ra diñ cañ . Ibi . ē . un² uifls q' tenet eā . P^atū diñ cañ . H' ƿra uaf x. soñ . Q'do recep . similið . T. R. E. similið . Hanc ƿra tenuit Goldin² hō comitis Heraldī . ñ potuit uendē ð dare sine ej² licentia.

The variations between the three *Domesdays* may be readily perceived in the following arrangement :—

- (1.) *Remembrancer's Domesday.* (2.) *Exchequer Domesday*
(p. 117.)

DEVENESCHIRE.

TERRA NICOLAI BALISTARIJ.

Nicholaus Balistari² teñ de
Rege Wiberie p diñ hið.

Nicolavs teñ de rege
Wiberie. Ordric teneð T. R. E.
7 geldð p diñ hida . T'ra . ē .

III. caŕ . Ibi . IIII. bord hñt . I
caŕ . 7 IIII. ac siluæ . 7 XX. ac
pasturæ . Olim . XII. deñ .
Modo uaſ XV. soſ.

Grennelize p III. v^l.

Ipse . Ni^{ten'} Grennelize .
Quattuor taini teneb T. R. E.
^{in parag'}
| 7 geldb . p . III. uirg̃ træ .
T'ra . ã . III. caŕ . q̃ ibi sſ cū I.
seruo 7 IIII. uiffi 7 III. bord . 7
II. ac p^ati . Oli . x. solid .
Modo uaſ XX. solid .

Stoches p II. v^l t diñ.

Ipse N. teñ Stoches . Ord-
ric teneb T. R. E. 7 geldb p .
II. uirg̃ . 7 dimid . T'ra . ã v.
caŕ . Ibi . sſ . IIII. car . 7 VI.
uiffi 7 VII. bord . 7 v. serui 7
III. ac . p^ati . 7 XX. ac pasturæ .
Oli 7 m^o uaſ XXX. solid .

(3.) *Exon Domesday* (p. 434, etc.)

TERRA NICOLAI ARBALESTarii IN DEVENESIRA.

§ ^{archibalistarius} Nicholaus hſ . I. mansionē quæ uocat^r Wibeberia. quā
tenuit Odriti². ea die q^a rex E. f. u. 7 . m. 7 reddidit Gildū p
^{m^o ten & reger' aculeus de Nicholao} diñ hiđ . hanc possſ arare III. carſ. Inde hſ ^R Nicholaus. I. uirgā
7 diñ in dn̄o 7. I. carſ. Ibi hſ N. IIII. bordarios. 7 XXX. oues.
7 IIII. agros nemoris. 7 . XX. agros pascuæ. 7 ual & p annū XV.
soſ. 7 q^odo N. recep̃ ualebat XII. deñ.

§ Nicolaus hſ I. q̃ uocat^r Grenneliza q teñ IIII. tagni parit.
ea die q^a E. rex f'. ũ. & m̄. & redd̄ gild p. II. uirg̃. has poss̄
arare III. carſ. Inde hſ. Nicolaus in dn̄o. I. uirgā. & I. carſ.
& uiff II. uirgas & . II. carſ. Ibi hſ N. IIII^{or}. uiff & III. bord.
& I. seruū & II. aḡ p^ati. & uaſ XX. soſ. p ann̄. & qdo recep̄.
uaſ. x. soſ. Istā manš hſ nicolaus p escanbiis.

§ Nicolaus hſ. I. mansionē que uocat^r Stoches. quā tenuit

Ordritius ea die qua rex E. f u 7 . m. 7 reddidit Gildū p diñ hida. 7 diñ uirga. hanc possē arare v. carrucē. Inde hñ Nicholaus in dñio. I. uirga. 7 II. carī. & uillani. hñt II. cañ. Ibi hñ Nicholaus VI. uillanos. 7 VII. bordā. 7 v. seruos. 7 II. animalia. 7 lx. oues. 7 III. agros prati. 7 xx. agros pascuæ. 7 ual& p annū xxx. soł. 7 quando Nicholaus recepit ualebat tantūdē.

The MS. of the King's Remembrancer's Office appears, from the character of the writing, to have been made about the twelfth century; but there is not sufficient evidence to determine the actual period. It does not appear that either of these MSS. is noticed in the published Dissertation on *Domesday* by Sir Henry Ellis. But Ellis most certainly knew of both these MSS. from his notes in Webb's tract. This volume probably, at some period, formed one of the muniments of a Welsh religious establishment, or was possessed by the family of *Breuse*; and there are no reasons which satisfactorily account for its appearance in its present repository.

3. The Arundel Domesday, which is the third abridged text, is a folio volume of the twelfth century, consisting of 85 vellum leaves. It contains the returns for only twenty-four counties, and is otherwise imperfect by the omission of notices of payments due to the king. But it has a great value as an ancient text, and should be collated with the Exchequer Domesday, in any new edition of the Domesday Book for the projected Society.

The counties are taken in the same order as in the preceding volume, but the following are wanting:—Kent, Sussex, Surrey, Hampshire, Berkshire, Derbyshire; and after Rutlandshire follows only the *civitas et comitatus Eboraci*. A leaf is wanting between f. 47 and f. 48, and another between f. 77 and 78. The illustrious author Gale has written some Domesday notes at the beginning of the volume, and considers the MS. to be a copy of the *abbreviatio* or abridged

Exchequer Domesday Book No. 1 of my present class. This MS. formerly belonged to the abbey of Margam in Glamorganshire, a monastery which has also contributed other valuable MSS. to our native collections. It is curious that No. 2, the *Breviate*, comes apparently from S. Wales.

Among the many comprehensive works on subjects connected with Domesday which demand the consideration of the future editor, with a view to their republication either wholly or in part, is the *Dom-Boc*, a translation into English by the Rev. Wm. Bawdwen, Vicar of Hooton-Pagnell. The MSS. of Mr. Bawdwen are preserved in the British Museum MS. Department. In 1809 the portion relating to Yorkshire was printed, and in 1812 a second volume containing the counties of Middlesex, Hertford, Buckingham, Oxford, and Gloucester, was published. The whole of the Bawdwen MSS. ought to be edited by a Society such as that which I desire to see established.

Separate counties have attracted individual students, and in the promised bibliography in preparation by Mr. Wheatley which is to form one of the literary features of this Commemoration, we shall no doubt find a very complete list of Domesday publications. The Library of the British Museum is very rich in them, and a selection of the finest has been already exhibited to us by the Keeper of the Printed Books.

Among those which demand a passing notice are :—For CAMBRIDGESHIRE, the *Inquisitio Cantabrigiensis* of Hamilton, edited in relation to the Ely Domesday, as I have already stated. There is also a treatise by the Rev. Bryan Walker on the ‘Measurements and Valuations’ in the ‘Cambridge Antiquarian Society,’ 1881, vol. v. p. 95, and a supplement in 1884.

Cheshire attracted an early antiquary, Sir Peter Leycester, who published in 1673 a folio transcript in his ‘Historical Antiquities.’ Ormerod also in 1851–6 gives in his ‘Miscellanea Palatina’ a memoir of the Cheshire Domesday.

These works are fairly within the scope of the Domesday Book Society's work for examination, and possibly for re-printing. Beaumont's recent labour on Lancashire and Cheshire Domesday Book is a work worthy of highest commendation. Cornwall has no separate and distinctly local edition of Domesday Book. Derbyshire has however two exponents of her Domesday. J. P. Yeatman published an octavo, and the late well-known archæologist, Mr. Llewellyn Jewitt, in 1871, a folio Domesday of that county.

For Dorsetshire reference must be made to the important collections of the late Rev. R. Eyton in the British Museum, and also to that author's 'Key to Domesday,' written with especial reference to the Dorset Survey. Hutchins' 'History of Dorsetshire,' and J. R. Planché's 'Family of Robert Fitz-Gerald,' the Domesday tenant of Corfe, a paper in the *Journal of the 'British Archæological Society'* (vol. xxviii.), may also be consulted with advantage by the student of Dorsetshire Domesday.

In Essex, we have the work of Chissenhale; for Gloucester that of Alfred S. Ellis and Rudder's History; for Hampshire the names of R. Warner, 1789, and Henry Moody, a folio published in 1862.

J. Duncumb's Herefordshire collections will be found to contain useful notices of Herefordshire Domesday Book.

For Hertfordshire the county histories of Clutterbuck and others must be examined, there being, as far as my research extends, no separate work on the Domesday Book for this county. Huntingdonshire Domesday has been illustrated by Robert Ellis in 1864, and for Kent there is the fine large folio work of the Rev. L. B. Larking, with notes of high value, and Mr. Elton, a well-known writer on antiquarian manners and customs, has given in his *Tenures of Kent*, vi., the Domesday Survey of Kent.

The work of Henshall and Wilkinson in 1799, in 4to, con-

taining the Domesday of the counties of Kent, Sussex, and Surrey, is worthy of consideration and research. It is not, however, very often to be met with.

The Lancashire Domesday Book of Beaumont is already mentioned.

Leicestershire Domesday must be studied in the pages of Nichols' 'History of Leicestershire.' Lincolnshire and Rutland have formed the theme of a work by C. G. Smith in 1870.

Middlesex, strange to say, still lacks a commentator. About 1876 Gen. Pl. Harrison published a poorly executed facsimile.

Norfolk Domesday has been made the subject of an analysis by the Rev. G. Mumford, in 1858, 8vo. For Northampton there is the folio 'Natural History of Northamptonshire,' by J. Morton, in the early years of the eighteenth century. Of another class is the work of Mr. S. A. Moore, published in 1863 in folio.

Somerset and Stafford Domesday attracted the attention of Eyton, whose exhaustive works upon them leave nothing to be desired. It should be a source of regret to us all assembled here to-day that that gifted author was not spared to carry on to its completion his great work of scientific analysis and investigation of Domesday, county by county.

Surrey Domesday was treated by the Rev. Owen Manning, Vicar of Godalming (an intelligent antiquary of his day, as shown by his edition of King Alfred's will), as well as in Manning and Bray's 'History of Surrey,' 1773.

Sussex has, perhaps latest of all the English counties, been illustrated as to its Domesday by the excellent work of Rev. W. D. Parish, Vicar of Selmeston, an antiquary of reputation. This work, published in 1886, corresponds to that of Larking for Kent, and that of Beaumont for Lancashire and Cheshire. Warwickshire has had its Domesday Survey discussed by W. Reader in 1835, with a second edition in 1879, and by Chas.

Twamley in the 21st vol. of the 'Archæological Journal' for 1864. Wiltshire had a critical editor for its Domesday Survey apart from the work on the subject by H. Penruddocke Wyndham, in 8vo, 1788. The late Rev. W. H. Jones, Vicar of Bradford-on-Avon, and Canon of Salisbury (to whom archæologists owe a large debt for the discovery of the early Saxon Church of St. Lawrence, near his parish church), carefully edited the Wiltshire Domesday Book in 1865.

Worcestershire still wants an editor for the Domesday of the county. In the Cottonian MS. of Heming in the British Museum, Tiberius, A. xiii., is a portion which should be collated with the original MS. at the Record Office. It has been printed by Hearne in Heming's Chartulary of Worcester, 1722, pp. 481-512. Nash also, in his 'County History,' 1782, has printed parts of the Surveys.

The Domesday Book for the extensive county of Yorkshire is still inadequately represented, notwithstanding the labour of A. S. Ellis in 'Yorkshire Archæological Journal,' 1878, and the earlier dissertation of Whitaker in his 'Richmondshire.'

In addition to these detailed works on portions of the Domesday, there are the essays and brochures of Carteret Wells in 1756; Kelham, 1788; Nichols, 1795; Hutchins, 1815; Grose, 1773; Ellis, *Introduction*; J. Burt, 1861; J. F. Morgan, 1858; Toulmin Smith, 1861-3; Brady, Maseres, Sir Thomas Phillipps, T. Gale, G. Hickes, Paine, and many others, the titles of which Mr. Wheatley has carefully gathered up in his Bibliography recently distributed among us. Many of these require and deserve re-issue for the sterling worth of their contents.

'No other country in the western world,' says Beaumont in his 'Domesday Book of Cheshire and Lancashire,' 1882, 'can produce such a book as Domesday, a register containing the names of its landed proprietors, with their properties, tenures,

laws, and customs eight hundred years ago (for the year 1886 is the eight hundredth anniversary of its compilation), and which, remaining in perfect preservation, still forms the great mine to which the topographer, the legal antiquary, and the historian must repair for light in their various inquiries. A document so old and so venerable, and compiled in an age so unlike our own, might be expected to present many difficulties. Since it appeared, society has undergone vast changes, and very many of the terms of Domesday, having either obtained new and different meanings, or become obsolete, have given rise to controversies which are not yet ended. Notwithstanding this drawback, however, it has an interest for the general reader, either in the notices which it contains of familiar places, or of events and persons known to him by history, and in its occasional glimpses of the manners, laws, and customs prevailing among our ancestors which time and distance have now rendered quaint and picturesque. When the Conqueror, to whom the idea of this great national rent-roll is due, saw the achievement of his work, he regarded it as a beacon tower from which he could survey at one view, as it were in all their length and breadth, the resources of his new kingdom, and doubtless his heart swelled with pride when he thought of their extent and of the ready means it afforded him to avail himself of them at his pleasure. But to us, to-day, the Domesday Book presents itself in another and nobler light, for we have learned to look upon that Book not as a badge of bondage, but as our proudest national monument; which shows how, one by one, feudal fetters have yielded to the swelling germ of freedom innate in the English breast; and as a landmark pointing to the place whence our ancestors started on that long and steady march which has led to the constitutional liberty that our country now so pre-eminently enjoys.'

Much might be said here as to the necessity for a new

edition of the texts. Grand and comprehensive as it is, the Record edition is to most a sealed book of insurmountable mystery. I fear that it, indeed, has many weak points, viz. the unhandy size of this edition, its great price, its rarity, and its want of collation. Its indexes require much revision if it is to be brought up to the standard which Eyton has erected in the case of the Domesday for Dorset and Somerset and Stafford, of which his so-called Studies (really exhaustive dissection and tabulation) are examples beyond praise. In these days of the rapid multiplication of new societies for specialised scientific work, there is no subject that one can conceive more thoroughly national and universally attractive and interesting than the Domesday Book; and if the Society could be formed (as I have every encouragement to hope that it will be, *à propos* of this eight hundredth anniversary of the completion of the original Domesday,) not only of workers who would undertake to edit and collate the texts, and prepare tabulations, dissections, indexes, glossaries, and even maps, but also of helpers and annual subscribers who would be pleased to derive instruction from these works when published, and to foster the systematic efforts of their associates, I feel convinced that in a few years we should have a uniform series of authoritative Domesday publications, each complete in itself, which would be a credit to the literary reputation of our country and a perennial monument to those who have in any part aided in its production. I will say in conclusion that a preliminary meeting of the friends and supporters of the Society will be duly announced, and I shall be glad if any of those here present who desire to join will favour me with their names or communicate with me at the British Museum.

The Official Custody of Domesday Book.

By HUBERT HALL, F.S.A., F.R.HIST.S.

THE Domesday Survey as a record is to be regarded as a return made to a Commission of Inquiry, both into the tenures and customs of Norman England, and into the resources of the crown and the value of land throughout the kingdom.

The mode of procedure prescribed to the Commissioners may be further regarded as a schedule to the Commission itself; as 'forma inquisitionis, quomodo justiciarii regis inquirent.' For though it would be difficult to prove that this or any other inquest of the period depended upon aught save an informal precept of the crown, issued perhaps verbally to the Commissioners before the Witan or Curia, the official nature of the transaction cannot be disguised. Here we have only an actual expression of the royal wishes upon a certain occasion instead of the legal fiction of a more elaborate stage of official development, in which the king salutes his faithful minister, and requires such and such a return to be forthwith made for his official information.

The result of this Commission, then, however authorised, was Domesday Book, compiled from evidence collected by the Royal Commissioners and their subordinates. As Domesday Book was of official origin, so it was thenceforth preserved in

official custody, being probably at once deposited in the Royal Treasury. And this is supported by an ancient MS.¹ quoted by Madox which states that 'Quand ceste chose fust enquis, fust mis en escrit et porte au Roy, et sont encore gardez *cum en Tresor*.' Therefore from 1086 till the reign of Henry I. we may suppose that Domesday Book lay in the King's Treasury. We next find it as a Record of the Exchequer.

The subject of the earliest resting-place of Domesday Book has been one of continued interest to several generations of antiquaries, and the uncertainty which has always prevailed thereon is an excellent example of the almost insuperable difficulties encountered in the pursuit of an apparently simple piece of information connected with the practice of antiquity. Ayloffe and Palgrave, and before them 'the elaborate Mr. Madox,' who perhaps investigated the matter more deeply than others, were unable to arrive at any definite conclusion, and the evidence which they collected has been merely repeated by later writers to still less purpose.

Three theories may be mentioned as chiefly entertained by modern scholars upon this subject :—(1) The 'Winchester' theory, or that in favour of the preservation of Domesday in the Winchester Treasury from 1086 to an indefinite date not earlier than the close of the twelfth century, or even later. (2) The 'Westminster' theory, depending on the statements of pseudo-Ingulphus and other chroniclers. This theory is in effect that the book was preserved continuously at Westminster. (3) The 'Winchester-Westminster' theory, which insists on its removal from the former to the latter place at a comparatively early date, probably about the commencement of the reign of Henry II.

These three theories, which have in fact a common origin, may be briefly detailed as follows.

¹ Ex MSS. Trin. Coll. Cambr.

'Exchequer' is a word loosely used to denote a place of Receipt or custody of Treasure or Records, or for the transaction of business touching the king's revenue. There were several such Exchequers during the early period, but two only of importance, those at Westminster and Winchester. At first the regular Exchequer seems to have been held at Winchester, probably because the royal Treasure was deposited there with the Regalia, &c. It was here doubtless that Domesday Book was first kept as the nucleus of a collection of official records following the organisation of the Curia in the reign of Henry I. Here it would be joined by the Great Pipe Rolls of that reign (of which one only survives) and such official compilations or deposited charters as we find in greater abundance in the reign of Henry II.

As late as the thirty-first year of Henry I. it is believed that the Exchequer, together with the Treasure and Records, was still at Winchester. It does not of course follow that the Exchequer of the Barons was permanently located at Winchester, but it seems most probable that the Receipt of the Exchequer, *id est* Treasury, Records, and clerical staff was usually to be found there.

Early in the reign of Henry II. the Exchequer of the Barons was apparently removed to Westminster, which continued to be its headquarters until the permanent location of the Law Courts. It is probable, however, that the treasure and ancient records were not removed to the capital for many years after the reorganisation of the Exchequer under Bishop Nigel. It even appears that the business of the Exchequer was still occasionally transacted at Winchester. An Exchange was made there 'ad scaccarium' before the King and Barons in the lifetime of the younger King Henry, and therefore later than 1170. The evidence of the Pipe Rolls tends to show the presence of a Treasury at Winchester as late as the twenty-third year at least. It would seem that treasure was

constantly conveyed thence to different parts of the kingdom, or to follow the Court, or by land-carriage to Southampton, whence it was shipped for the king's use when he was abroad. In the seventh year we have a notice of the removal of an *arca* or chest such as was chiefly used for the custody of Records.¹ The entry reads thus: 'Et ad conducendam arcam de Wintonia ad Lundoniam.' Now some have thought it possible that this *arca* was the same one that is known to have contained Domesday Book together with the King's Seal in the twenty-third year of the reign. It is true, indeed, that an *arca* was a Record-chest, and not, as is generally supposed, a Treasure-chest; for, although we sometimes have notices of the removal of treasure or of its custody in chests called 'huchia,' which seem to have been also used for the conveyance of Records, *arca* is never used except in the above sense. So the *arca thesauri* frequently mentioned in the Pipe Rolls was of this nature, for had it not been so it would have been described as 'arca cum thesauro.' Again, we have the repeated definition of the nature and use of such *arcæ* by a contemporary Treasurer of the Exchequer, who also gives us quite another account of the method of preserving the bullion in sacks or cases. We may consider, too, the parallel case of the 'arca judæorum,' which was exclusively used for the preservation of the Records of the Judaism. So, too, in the very next year after the removal of the Winton *arca* we read in the Pipe Roll² 'et pro conducenda arca cum rotulis de Hurdfordia ad Lundoniam.' These might have been the rolls of the Justices Itinerant. We sometimes, too, find *arcæ* used for the custody of Tallies, which were a species of Records, and even of the dies of the king's moneyers. Therefore it appears fairly certain³ that when the scribe (who may have

¹ Pipe Roll, 7 Hen. II. Hants.

² Pipe Roll, 8 Hen. II. Hants.

³ Pipe Roll, Hen. II., showing the despatch of the *arca thesauri* from Winchester for use at both the Easter and Michaelmas Exchequers. This evidence is especially relied on by the advocates of the Winchester theory.

been writing under the eye of the author of 'Dialogus' himself, for he was about that time filling the place of Bishop Nigel the Treasurer, then disabled by illness, and we know that the Great Roll was penned by the scribe from the Treasurer's dictation) entered in the Roll the removal of an *arca* from Winchester to London he meant a Record-chest and not a Treasure-chest, for he enters the latter throughout in a totally different form, as 'ad conducendum thesaurum,' or 'pro huchiâ ad thesaurum portandum,'¹ although this is not evidence as to the transfer of Domesday Book from Winchester to Westminster in the seventh year of the reign. This Winton *arca* would have been quite capable of containing the ancient Records of that period, which would comprise only Domesday Book itself and the few early Pipe Rolls which had escaped the havoc of Stephen's reign, and which Swereford very little later speaks of as being few in number. On the other hand it may be contended by some

¹ *Illustrations of the distinction between Arca and Hugia.*

(A) *Arca.*

1. Arca cum tallis from Winchester to London	. . .	1158
2. Arca cum rotulis from Hertford to London	. . .	1162
3. Arca conveyed from Winchester to London	. . .	1161
4. Arca thesauri from Winchester to London	. . .	1164
5. Arca thesauri from Winchester to North ^t	. . .	1164
6. Arca monetariorum cum cuneis from and to Winchester	. . .	1180

(B) *Hugia.*

1. For 1 hugia to preserve the Barons' charters when the Exchequer was in Wilts	1166
2. For carrying the king's harness	1168
3. Treasure and the hugiæ of the Treasury (abroad)	1169
4. The hugia of the Treasury to London from Wycombe	1170
5. The hugia of the Treasury from London to Winchester	1171
6. For 2 great hugiæ and repairing strong door of Treasury at Winton	1179
7. For 1 hugia to put treasure in at North ^t	1179
8. For 1 hugia to carry treasure in to North ^t	1179
9. For 2 hugiæ and 2 vats for treasure from London to Windsor	1185
10. For 1 hugia and 2 vats for treasure at Salisbury	1188

that Domesday Book was never preserved at all at Winchester, but at London. It has been thought possible, too, that there were two Domesday Books, in common parlance, in use at either centre ; and that the great Register itself was preserved at Westminster, whilst the Winton Book, or the originals of the Survey, were equally consulted at Winchester for local evidence. Nevertheless, in the face of the evidence from Records as to the existence of the main Treasury at Winchester, and the subsequent practice of preserving Domesday Book with the Seal and other Records in an *arca* similar to that which appears to have been used for the conveyance of Records from Winchester to London and other places, as well as the evidence of Swereford,¹ who styles it 'Rotulus Wintoniæ sive Domusdey vel liber hidarum,' and lastly that of the book itself, in which it is described as 'Liber Wintoniensis,' not to mention the local tradition, as old as the seventeenth century, of the existence of a 'Domesday vault' in the church² of Winchester: it is more probable that it was not removed to London till late in the reign of Henry II. In the twenty-third year of that reign, or perhaps somewhat later, since the 'Dialogus' seems to have been antedated by its author, we find the Exchequer firmly settled at Westminster with the Treasure and Records, including Domesday Book.³

Having given the substance of the above kindred theories as being those hitherto entertained by Madox and other authorities, I will venture now to advance a fourth theory, which, while it differs from all the above, will be found, I believe, to reconcile the conflicting evidence of each.

The city of Winchester was both the natural capital of the West-Saxon kingdom and the place of coronation and

¹ *Liber Rubens Scaccarii*, fo. XLVII.

² Or more probably Castle of Winchester.

³ *Dialogus de Scaccario*, i. 14.

burial of West-Saxon kings as well as the official seat of their court and treasury. Here we may suppose the king's 'hoard' was deposited, together with the regalia and plate, and such official records as existed for the period. These would probably include the standard work of Alfred, known as the *Domboc*, and those counterparts of charters which served the purpose of a primitive enrolment. William I. made at least such use of Saxon laws and regal customs as to justify the belief that the royal Treasury and official importance of Winchester continued through the early Norman period, and that the record of Domesday Survey was naturally deposited in the Treasury there.

Perhaps even in Norman times the transfer of the coronation ceremony to Westminster has a greater significance than we have imagined, that is to say, as indicating the displacement of Winchester as the financial centre in favour of a new official organisation at Westminster twenty years before the accepted date.

At this earliest period of its existence, however, we must not suppose that the Domesday register formed any part of an Exchequer system at Westminster. There is every reason for believing that the audit machinery of the ancient Treasury at Winchester was sufficient for the purpose, and that Domesday was merely consulted on these occasional translations for the king's personal information in his curia or council. It is true, indeed, that the earliest germ of the Exchequer is perceptible in these accounts, which were, however, audited not 'ad scaccarium,' but 'ad taleas,' i.e. in the Treasury or Receipt at Winchester. The Exchequer proper, consisting of two chambers—Exchequer of the Barons (in two compartments, 'Thalamus' and 'Solium') and Exchequer of Receipt (in two divisions also, 'Scriptorium' and 'Thesaurus')—was elaborated in its full perfection in the reign of Henry I. at Westminster, which became henceforth its headquarters. At the

same time we find in the Pipe Rolls the old Treasury at Winchester used as a permanent storehouse for the reserve of treasure, regalia, and records, and we even find Exchequer business transacted there by way of audit of accounts, which formed a special office or 'ministerium' as late as 1130.¹ It might even be supposed that early in the reign of Henry I. the Seal and Records, including Domesday Book, were removed from Winchester to the Treasury of the new Exchequer at Westminster. This depends partly on our knowledge of the conservative character of Exchequer procedure and partly on the authority of the "*Dialogus de Scaccario*," a nearly contemporary official record. In the reign of Henry II., having been suspended probably during the whole reign of Stephen, certainly since 1139, the Exchequer was revived at Westminster under the auspices of Bishop Nigel, the ex-Treasurer of Henry I., and at Westminster we find the Seal, Domesday Book, and other working records still deposited, on the same authority. There is, of course, the alternative theory that Domesday Book was still preserved at Winchester, at least during the reigns of Henry I. and Stephen, partly because what is considered as an Exchequer existed there and partly because of the common opinion that the Exchequer was not established until late in the reign of Henry I., while the official importance of the Bishop of Winchester and the unrest of Stephen's reign may have rendered the further detention of these invaluable records in the stronghold of Winchester Castle desirable. Against this we have the evidence (which is here most explicit) of the '*Dialogus*,' as well as that of the chroniclers, that the Exchequer was established quite early in the reign of Henry I., and that there were numerous annual Pipe Rolls is a necessary consequence of this early existence.

Now it is a fact of the greatest importance that the bulk of these rolls had been destroyed before the reign of Henry

¹ Pipe Roll, 31 Hen. I.

II., during the civil wars of Stephen's reign. The author of the 'Dialogus' alludes to the surviving rolls as a rarity, and he describes a scene at the Exchequer early in the reign of Henry II.,¹ in which one of these venerable rolls is produced with startling effect. Besides this we have the explicit words of Swereford,² very little later, that he had seen 'some few' rolls of that reign, and it is hardly possible that they could have been destroyed between the date at which he wrote and that of the 'Dialogus' during the best days of the Exchequer. If these rolls were destroyed, how is it then that any survived, and that Domesday Book did not share their fate? Because, it may be answered, these surviving rolls and Domesday Book were preserved in the Treasury of the Exchequer at Westminster, being required for constant reference; and strength is given to this supposition by the date of the surviving roll which we still possess, viz., that of the thirty-first year. It is possible, then, that the last few year rolls (being required, as we know, for the compilation of the current roll) and Domesday Book (in constant use for estimating the fermes of counties, &c.), being still at Westminster when the Exchequer came to a standstill at the beginning of Stephen's reign, escaped and were preserved until the re-establishment of the Exchequer under Henry II.; whilst the earlier records, together probably with the original rolls of Domesday, were destroyed at Winchester when the town was occupied and fired (and the Treasury doubtless sacked) by the rebels in 1141. One fact at least can be adduced which renders any such conjectures as the above highly plausible, namely, that in the second year of Henry II. there were Exchequer Houses at Westminster so old as to be in need of repair.³

This theory does unfortunately dispose of the supposed removal of Domesday Book from Winchester to London,

¹ *Dial.* i. 11.

² *Liber Rubens Scaccarii*, fo. XLVII.

³ Pipe Roll, 2 Henry II. London and Middlesex.

either in 1161, or 1164, or 1170, in an Arca such as was employed for the conveyance of records from Winchester to London on those and other occasions during the reign of Henry II. On the other hand, it is far more satisfactory to be able to submit a definite date (say 1138 or thereabouts) for the removal of this and other needful records to the Westminster Exchequer. Once established there, we need trouble ourselves little about its future position. The 'Dialogus' (which asserts the existence of an ancient Exchequer at Westminster, and distinguishes between it and the mere Treasury at Winchester in two remarkable passages) tells us further that it was an established usage of the Exchequer that the Seal, Domesday Book, the great year rolls, and other records, '*quæ, consedente scaccario, quotidianis usibus necessaria sunt,*' should never quit the Exchequer of Receipt. Of course this does not prevent Domesday from having to take casual journeys '*post regem,*' that is, when the Exchequer followed the king. It may even have crossed the Channel under these circumstances, when the Exchequer staff, with a shipload of treasure and records, was summoned abroad on financial business more than once. But it is far more likely that the great book dragged on an uneventful career between the Thesaurus and Scriptorium at Westminster from the reign of Henry II. at least down to the times of Madox, the great historian of the Exchequer of the kings of England.

In conclusion, it will be evident from the above statement that the origin of the mystery is to be found in the existence of a double Treasury at Winchester and Westminster, while its solution depends on the identification of Domesday, from Henry I. onwards, with one of these, the Westminster.

We may therefore summarise this new theory in the four following propositions. (1) That the working Records (with the Seal and Domesday) were preserved in the Exche-

quer. (2) That this Treasury was situate in the Exchequer of Receipt. (3) That this Exchequer of Receipt was annexed to the Exchequer proper. (4) That this Exchequer was at Westminster from early times. The evidence that I have collected in support of this view may be condensed as follows.

A. NOTICES IN THE PIPE ROLLS OF A TREASURY AT WESTMINSTER AND WINCHESTER IN CONNECTION WITH THE EXCHEQUER.

WINCHESTER—Geoffrey de Clinton pays 310 marks for the ministry of the Treasury of Winchester in the 31st year of Henry I. Westminster Treasure conveyed to Shoreham. For the repair of the houses of the Exchequer 76s. 8d. in the 2nd year of Henry II. For the livery of Roger Usher of the Treasury, in the same year. WINCHESTER—Treasure conveyed to Cricklade in the same year. Remitted to Gervase of the Treasury in the same year. WINCHESTER—The king's crown conveyed to St. Edmunds in the 4th year and to Worcester in the 5th year. The Regalia to London in the 16th year. WESTMINSTER—Roger Usher of the Treasury receives 2 marks to go to Normandy in the 8th year. WINCHESTER—The king's plate conveyed to Berkhamstead against Christmas in the 9th year. The 'arca' of the Treasury conveyed to London against Easter, and to Northampton against Michaelmas in the 10th year. A treasure chest conveyed to Southampton in the 15th year. Treasure and Regalia and Rolls and Tallies of the Treasury conveyed to London in the 16th year. WESTMINSTER—Treasure conveyed in carts to Winchester and elsewhere in the 19th and 20th years. WINCHESTER—Treasure conveyed to the seaports for transport abroad in the 19th and 20th years under the charge of 'servientes de thesauro.' WESTMINSTER—Treasure conveyed to Gloucester 'post regem' in the 21st year. WINCHESTER—25th year, the King's plate conveyed to Woodstock; Treasure many times conveyed to London and elsewhere by the 'servientes thesauri'; for repairing the 'Ostium' of the '*Treasury of Winchester*.' WESTMINSTER—25th year, Treasure many times conveyed to Winchester and elsewhere; for treasure chests and sacks. WINCHESTER—Treasure conveyed in carts to London (Tower) to be recoined in the 26th year. The moneyers' chest with the dies

conveyed to Oxford and Northampton and returned to Winchester in the same year. WESTMINSTER—Treasure conveyed in carts to Winchester and elsewhere in the 27th year, and throughout England in the 31st year. WINCHESTER—For the charge of counting and weighing the Treasure at Winchester, and for new boxes to lay up the same treasure in and for conveying treasure from Winchester throughout England in the 32nd year. WESTMINSTER—Treasure conveyed to Winchester and elsewhere in the 34th year. WINCHESTER—Treasure conveyed to the seaports for transport abroad in the 34th year.

B. NOTICES IN THE 'DIALOGUS DE SCACCARIO' OF A TREASURY AT WESTMINSTER IN CONNECTION WITH THE EXCHEQUER.

'Anno xxij. . . cum sederem ad fenestram speculæ quæ est juxta fluvium *Tamensem*.' ('Dialogus,' Proëm.) 'Est enim inferius scaccarium, quod et recepta dicitur, *ubi pecunia numeranda traditur* ut de eisdem postmodum *in superiori compotus reddatur*.' ('Dial.' i. 2.) '*Illic* est miles . . . argentarius . . . fusor . . . quatuor computatores . . . *ostiarius thesauri* et vigil.' (*Ibid.* i. 3.) 'Clericus thesaurarii cum fuerit numerata pecunia . . . *pecuniæ saccis et archis et forulis* in quibus *rotuli* vel talliæ collocantur . . . apponit sigillum.' (*Ibid.*) 'Commune est eis [camerariis] cum clerico thesaurarii ut per brevia regis vel precepto baronum thesaurum susceptum expendant.' (*Ibid.*) 'Hii tres . . . cum thesauro mittuntur cum oportuerit.' (*Ibid.*) 'Licet [thesaurum expendere] . . . de liberationibus servientum inferioris scaccarii et de minutis necessariis scaccarii emendis.' (*Ibid.*) 'Qui vero breve regis . . . detulerit pro pecunia . . . antequam exeat susceptam pecuniam numeret quod si quid defuerit *redeat ad scaccarium* . . . et hoc facto solvatur ei . . . numerata prius eadem . . . a constitutis computatoribus. Si vero . . . *ostium thesauri* egressus fuerit . . . non ei respondeatur.' (*Ibid.*) Quatuor computatorum officium hoc est, cum *in scaccarium* numeranda pecunia mittitur.' (*Ibid.*) 'Ad ostiarii curam spectat ut . . . diligens sit in custodia omnium quæ *ostio* concluduntur.' (*Ibid.*) 'In termino eodem pro incausto totius anni *ad utrumque scaccarium* ij solidi debentur, quos sibi *de antiquo jure* vindicat sacrista majoris Ecclesiæ *Westmonasterii*.' (*Ibid.*) 'Quatuor computatores quisque iij denaries, si *Londoniæ* fuerint; si *Wintoniæ*, quia inde solent assumi, duos quisque habet.' (*Ibid.*) 'Ad ipsum [cancellarium] pertinet custodia

sigilli regii quod est in thesauro, sed inde non recedit nisi cum . . . *ab inferiore ad superius scaccarium . . . defertur.*' (*Ibid.* i. 5.) 'Verum plura sunt in *repositoriis archis Thesauri*, quæ circumferuntur et includuntur et custodiuntur a thesaurario et camerariis, *sicut supra plenius ostensum est* : qualia sunt *sigillum regis . . . liber judiciarius*. . . magni annales . . . et pleraque alia quæ, *consedente scaccario, quotidianis usibus necessaria sunt.*' (*Ibid.* i. 14.) 'Porro liber ille [Domesday] *sigilli regii comes est individuus in thesauro.*' (*Ibid.* i. 15.) 'Numerata pecunia . . . in tuto loco reposta non efferuntur nisi cum ex Regis mandato in necessariis usibus distribuenda sibi mittantur.' (*Ibid.*) 'Cum regis thesaurus de loco in locum *majorum consideratione* deferendus, vehiculis et hujusmodi minoribus indiguerit.' (*Ibid.* ii. 7.)

In the Exchequer of Receipt at Westminster, according to the description given by the author of the 'Dialogus,' the money was placed in *rouleaux* in binns or sacks, and was deposited with the royal plate, &c., in a strong chamber or other place of safety. The Tallies were laid up in binns for the divers counties, and the Records were deposited in *arcæ* or chests. The appearance of such an *arca* as has been before alluded to is minutely described in the 'Dialogus.' It was secured with two dissimilar locks, the keys of which were kept by the two Chamberlains' knights, and it was also girded with a riveted band which was sealed for additional security with the Treasurer's seal. Receptacles of this kind are still further particularised by the author of 'Dialogus' as '*repositoriæ arcæ*'; and it is noticeable that the very building in which the book is now kept is commonly called the 'Repository,' to wit, of Records, and that the word archive to this day has a similar signification.

Of course, by this date the list of Exchequer Records would be greatly swelled, both by a score more of Great Rolls and many other subsidiary documents (spoken of in the 'Dialogus' as '*numerosa multitudo*'), so as to justify the use of the plural *arcæ* by the author of that treatise. The latter,

indeed, not only gives us a description of these *arcæ*, but a list of their contents. In one were preserved the King's Seal and Domesday Book, which is described as its inseparable companion, 'sigilli regii comes est individuus in Thesauro,' together probably with the more ancient and precious Records, such as the Great Pipe Roll of the 31st year of Henry I. and its fellows of that reign. In the other *arcæ* would be stored the remaining and more recent Pipe Rolls, together with the invaluable compilation called Rotulus Exactorius, now unhappily lost to us, and other subsidiary Records. Such was the environment, as I have figured it to myself, of Domesday Book in the oldest days of the Exchequer.

We may fairly take the practice and description of the Exchequer and its contents which is recorded by the author of 'Dialogus' as holding good during the official career of his younger contemporary and disciple, Swereford. We may even go further, and speak of this early period on the authority of Madox as extending down to the reign of Edward II. By this date the business of the Exchequer had become considerably diversified, and the official staff was modified accordingly. We have at least one notice of Domesday Book at this date,¹ namely the entry in the Issue Roll for the new binding of the quarto volume at a cost of 3*s.* 4*d.*

In the second year of Henry VI. the Regalia appear to have been formally placed in a leather case, which was then deposited together with the Crown in a chest with three locks in the great Treasury at Westminster.² Now it seems highly probable that the Seal and Domesday Book, with other selected Records, were transferred at the same time to this new *arca*: for at a somewhat later date we find the Book preserved by official tradition in just such a chest as this, which was secured with three locks, the keys of which were in the keeping of the Auditor and Chamberlains or Deputy

¹ Mich., 14 Ed. II. Dec. 5.

² Notes on the MSS.

Chamberlains of the Exchequer, and we find in the year 1618 a notice by one of the Deputy Chamberlains of such a chest, called the 'Chamberlain's chest,' in the Treasury, in which the Black Book of the Exchequer was preserved, and doubtless Domesday Book also. At a still later date this chest seems to have been placed in the Tally Court in the Exchequer, and in it were then preserved Domesday Book and the Great Seal. Now it is considered by several authorities highly probable that the great iron chest still preserved in the Public Record Office is this very *arca* of 1424, and that the small pocket at one end was intended to receive the Crown or the Great Seal. If this be so, we may consider that from 1424 to 1696 Domesday Book was preserved in a chest then known as the 'Chamberlain's chest,' but now more appropriately called the 'Domesday chest.' The 'Abbreviatio' of Domesday was preserved in a room adjoining to the Tally Court. Here, then, Domesday Book is supposed to have remained until the year 1696, when it was removed to the Chapter House, and thence to the Public Record Office in (I think) the year 1859.

The subject of the removal of Domesday from place to place at different times is in itself an interesting one, though there is very little evidence in point. We know at least that in the reigns of John, Edward I., and Edward II. it travelled with the Exchequer Records through the eastern counties to York, where it remained on one occasion for seven years. In the reign of Charles II. the whole of the Treasure, together with the Records of the Treasury of Receipt, was removed from Westminster to Nonsuch, 'at the time of the late dreadful Fire of London.' This removal was authorised by a Sign Manual dated September 1666. There is an interesting account preserved in the Audit Office Records,¹ by which it appears that the Guards were sent out to impress barges and labourers for the occasion. The Treasure was removed in

¹ Audit Office Declared Accounts. Bundle 865.

corded boxes, the Records being simply secured in bundles with ropes. They remained at Nonsuch under guard from Monday to Friday. The last removal of Domesday was to Southampton in 1859, for the purpose of being photographed.

Domesday Book as a record may be classified as one of those official compilations which had absolutely the force of Records; and it is the only specimen of that class which is known to us. It owed this honourable position both to its practical value, and also to its official compilation, preservation, and production before the Barons, or by exemplification before the King's Justices. The Red and Black Books of the Exchequer are examples of similar official compilations, which, however, are to be regarded rather as Precedent books than as legal Records. And this distinction is confirmed by the practice of the court in receiving these books 'pro evidentiâ sed non pro recordo.' Both these classes are somewhat sharply defined from monastic or other registers merely acquired by the Crown with the spoil of the monasteries, or as legal exhibits; though we know that the authority of some of these local 'Domesdays,' such as the lost Chester Roll, was very highly esteemed.

As a Record the authority of Domesday Book was unbounded. The author of 'Dialogus' tells us that it received its name by a happy metaphor, for that the judgment of the Last Day would not be more inevitable than the finding of this Record upon a matter in dispute. That this estimate is exaggerated might possibly be proved by cases in which its authority was reversed by a court of law.

There is a curious case reported in the Year Book (M. 34 Ed. III.), in which the Abbot of Tintern's villeins of the manor of Acle sought relief from certain unusual and oppressive services on the ground that the manor was in Ancient Demesne of the Crown.

'Are we of the Ancient Demesne or not?'

'That is no business of mine; certify the court, *if you can*, that you are.'

'We will send to the Exchequer to find out in Domesday.'

'And when this was done, it was found by the Domesday that they were not of the Ancient Demesne.'

It would appear, in fact, that this manor fell into the king's hands at a later date, and that this had been loosely regarded as equivalent to tenure in Ancient Demesne by those who had not taken the trouble to look up their position before coming into court.

On the other hand it was sometimes sought to prove that certain lands were *not* in Ancient Demesne; the object being here to escape the Tallage which always fell more heavily on such lands than on others. There is a case in the ninth year of Edward II. in which the tenants of Oswaldkirk, in the county of Notts, which was a soke formerly in Ancient Demesne, but had been granted by Henry III. in exchange, claimed to be exempt from Tallage as of Demesne, to which they had still been subject since the date of the exchange. Instead of this they claimed to be tallaged with the community of the county, which on inquiry was conceded to them.

In another case in the same year, certain townsmen of Rutlandshire complained that, though not in Ancient Demesne, they were tallaged as of such, and not with the community of the county. Whereupon the Barons were commanded, '*scrutato libro Regis qui vocatur Domus dei*,' to discover the facts and give relief accordingly.

Thus it would appear both that there was a tendency to treat lands which had fallen *in manu regis* later than Domesday as though they were properly in Ancient Demesne, and also that the authority of Domesday was sufficient, upon challenge, to dispose of any such innovation, whether attempted by the Crown or the subjects. Moreover, the whole question of

the position of towns which were or were not in Ancient Demesne towards the Tallage was greatly agitated at this time, as in the great case of the town of St. Albans. Therefore it is interesting to notice in the Issue Roll E., 6 Ed. III., an increase of salary to a clerk of the Exchequer for extracting from Domesday all the towns in Demesne for evidence in assessing the new Tallage.

Domesday Book, indeed, must have been in constant requisition in the Courts. A long list of its appearances, either bodily or by an office copy or exemplar, might be compiled from the county *Placita* and other sources; and it has been suggested that, just as we have a Shakespeare 'Century of Praise,' or a collection of every notice of our greatest poet for a hundred years after his death, so by 'Eight Centuries of Praise' of our greatest Record in the shape of a similar collection of historical criticism, including a tabulated statement of all the cases in which its evidence has been resorted to, our archæological literature should be enriched by a Domesday collection that could not fail to be serviceable to the cause of original research. It may be of interest to notice here, as a partial attempt to carry out such a compilation at a very early date, a collection of every reference to Domesday contained in the 'Dialogus de Scaccario.' This was the work of one John Bradshaw, a vice-chamberlain of the Exchequer in the year 1618; and two copies of it have curiously enough been preserved amongst the state papers of James I. This industrious official tells us that he used for the purpose the text of the Black Book, and he divides his matter into three heads, as follows: (1) The famous description of Liber Judiciarius which has been reproduced in the Handbook; (2) Definitions of archaic words which occur in Domesday; (3) Law cases in which Domesday has been certified. Such an attempt as this should have a high place in the sixth century of Domesday praise.

As a Record, then, Domesday has been certified in almost every conceivable case of dispute through the whole course of its official existence. Its mere *dictum* has decided the rights of the Crown, the franchises of Lords, the emoluments of the Church, the services of Tenants, the prosperity of Towns, and the social condition of Villeins. In the present day we may meet with many original examples amongst the buried wealth of the Chancery Miscellanea, and it is curious to note how, in some cases at least, care has to be taken to imitate as nearly as possible the calligraphy of the original. Perhaps this practice will account for several imitations which may be seen on the outside leaves of the book itself.

In view of this wealth of instances available, it will suffice to mention one case which is certainly remarkable by reason of the great constitutional, social, and even national interests which depended thereon.

It will be remembered that amongst the encroachments of the equitable jurisdiction of the Crown in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, none was more keenly resented by the common lawyers and the Puritan opposition than the abnormal jurisdiction of the Council of the West, as it was called, which withdrew Wales proper and the Marcher shires from the protection of the common law. Volumes of constitutional learning were penned by the champions of the prerogative and of the Common Law in the attempt to prove that the four border counties, or 'English shires' as they were called, were or were not partly within the Marches.

Now, amongst all the precedents which were cited on either side there was none which carried with it such conviction as a certain case in the reign of Edward III.,¹ in which the Barons of the Exchequer certified Montgomery and Cherbury to be within the county of Shropshire on the sole authority of Domesday Book. This case is an interesting

¹ Placita coram Rege, Mich. T. 9 Edw. III.

one in other respects. A foul murder and robbery had been committed within the church of St. Nicholas, in Montgomery, and the murdered man's widow in vain appealed the murderers before the bailiffs and coroners of the Liberty. Indeed the names of the offenders would indicate their kinship with some of the great men of the district. In view of these facts, the king's writ was directed to the Sheriff of Shropshire, enjoining him to remove the case before the King's Justices, since being '*adhuc indiscussum*' in the Court of the Franchise, '*non potest terminari*' except in the King's Court.

This was in Michaelmas term of the ninth year. The Sheriff, however, returned that the said town was not within his bailiwick, and that the local officers refused to acknowledge any jurisdiction other than that of the lord of the Castle. For fourteen more terms the case dragged on, collecting round it analogous cases of disputed jurisdiction in the Marcher districts. In vain the Sheriff was enjoined to distrain the bailiff's goods—there were none such within *his* bailiwick, or their bodies—they were '*non inventi*' within the same theoretical limits. It was apparently at this juncture that Domesday Book, as certified by the Barons, intervened to put matters right.

At least we know that in Domesday Book the position of the Shropshire and Gloucestershire marches is defined in this way, following the traditional line of Offa's dyke. Therefore, in Domesday Montgomery and Cherbury are in Shropshire, and Caerleon on Usk, the furthestmost part of Monmouth, is in Gloucestershire. This is all the more remarkable as by many later grants and charters, as well as by the authority of Edward IV.'s Council of the West, and of Henry VIII.'s Act of Union itself, the western parts of the English Marcher counties were still regarded as private franchises, while in the present day Montgomery is certainly in Wales. Thus we have the curious spectacle of an obsolete and illogical Survey

overriding established privileges, national prejudices, and political controversies by the mere force of its indisputable authority.

With this supreme instance of official authority it is perhaps time to bring this subject to a close. Interesting indeed would it be to describe the various receptions which the mighty volume has held in the past. What sovereigns of old turned its pages lovingly, what Barons of the Exchequer referred dexterously to cited passages of its contents, how Swereford or Agard, or Le Neve or Madox, consulted it, and to which of its custodians we are indebted for that scribbled learning on the fly-leaves, or even what in modern times (until this Commemoration-day) has been the preponderance of American or Teutonic visitors over native antiquaries. These passages in its life-history, however, like most other merely sensational details in the history of any subject, could only be conjectured at the expense of historical accuracy, and would perhaps be deemed of very little value even could they be revealed to us.

NOTE.

Since this paper was read a great deal has been written on the subject in various quarters. Indeed, this paper has proved, as it were, an introduction to a new and interesting subject of archæology, and one that is by no means yet exhausted. The following books and articles contain further and fuller information :—

‘Athenæum,’ Nov. 27, 1886; ‘Antiquary,’ Sept. 1887; ‘Archæological Review,’ Feb. 1889; ‘Court Life under the Plantagenets,’ ch. vii. Appt. ; these being by the author of the present paper, by whom also the subject will be still further discussed in a work, now in the press, entitled ‘Antiquities and Curiosities of the Exchequer’ (vol. i. of the Camden Library).

See also the several important articles on the same subject by Mr. Horace Round, especially those in the ‘Antiquary’ for June and July 1887.

An Early Reference to Domesday.

By J. HORACE ROUND, M.A.

THE record to which I am about to call your attention attracted my notice as one of the earliest documents in which reference is made to the great Survey. It is, from internal evidence, certainly subsequent to that Survey, but from the fact that those of whom it speaks as living are known to have been Domesday tenants, it must have been compiled not long afterwards.

It is printed in the excellent and valuable report on the MSS. of the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's, for which we are indebted to the Deputy-Keeper, and will be found in the Appendix to the Ninth Report of the Commission on Historical MSS. (i. 65 *b.*) I should describe it as a list of *invasiones* on the estates of the Dean and Chapter. The passage to which I invite your special attention is this :—

Petrus Valoniis aufert canonicis i hydam terræ et pratum cum nemore *quæ exauctores terræ eis juraverunt in descriptione Angliæ* pro qua scotum et consuetudinem regi reddunt.

Here, then, we have the Survey itself referred to as the 'descriptio Angliæ,' and the Commissioners, if we are so to understand it, as the 'exauctores terræ.'

Now we can fortunately identify the very passage in Domesday to which this appeal refers. We read in the entry of the Dean and Chapter's manor of Chingford (Essex):

De hoc manerio abstulit petrus de valoniis i hidam et viii acras prati que pertinebant manerio tempore regis eduardi et silvam ad l porcos. Valet x solidos. (ii. 12 b.)

This Peter is, of course, a well-known man. He occurs as a tenant *in capite* in all three of the Eastern counties, and he was Sheriff of Essex at the time of the Survey. He may have taken advantage of his official position to commit this aggression.

There are several points suggested by these entries. In the first place they raise the question of the Commissioners' judicial action. Did they merely register conflicting claims, or did they sometimes adjudicate upon them? Mr. Freeman seems to take the former view, though he does not specially discuss the point. Mr. Eyton took the latter view, but subsequently modified, if he did not abandon it.¹ Much depends on the right rendering of the passage in the Chapter record. It would seem impossible that the 'exauctores terræ' can have been, not the Commissioners, but the 'Hundred,' that is to say the jurors. Even if we read 'exactores,' such a term was somewhat obsolete, by this time, for 'reeves,' and the reeves only formed a small portion of the jurors. Yet it is difficult to see how the term 'juraverunt' can apply to a

¹ 'The Legati,' he observes, 'held, and in most cases determined Placita, that is, settled many coeval questions of title, registered doubts and evidence where they did not decide, and in one or two seeming instances left the decision to the king.' (*Notes on Domesday* [Shropshire Arch. Soc. 1877]). But he added a footnote: 'This was written, either under a misconstruction of particular passages in Domesday, or else after an insufficient examination of the Record as a whole. My present conviction is that the Legati never tried questions of title unless specially directed by the Crown to do so. Their function in cases of doubtful title was to state all sides of a question, not to decide. On this ground the title of *Liber Judicialis*, sometimes applied to Domesday, seems inappropriate. (See *Domesday Studies*, Somerset, p. 7.) This latter remark, we may note, rests on a misapprehension. Mr. Chester Waters writes that 'each Commission had authority within its own circuit to examine witnesses on oath, and to adjudicate on questions of disputed title' (*Survey of Lindsey*, p. 4), but, as usual, no authority is given for this statement, which probably represents a confused echo of the views of Mr Eyton.

decision of the Commissioners. As bearing on this question, it might, perhaps, be suggested that we have an instructive contrast between such a phrase as '*abstulit* petrus de valoniis,' &c. (ii. 12 *b*), and that which, facing it on the opposite page, refers to another of the Chapter's manors, '*Radulfus baignard tenet* dimidiam hidam et hundret nescit quomodo eam habuerit' (ii. 13 *b*). The latter appears to leave the question open, and the former to record a virtual decision of the Commissioners in favour of the Chapter and against Peter. One phrase, it must at least be admitted, is positive, while the other is negative. While on this point, attention may be called to a very remarkable entry in Domesday: '*Hæc terra fuit tainland T.R.E. sed postea conversa est in reueland, et ideo dicunt legati regis quod ipsa terra et census qui inde exit furtim aufertur regi*' (i. 181). Here we have a record of a decision (or shall we say an assertion?) of the Commissioners, consequent on the statements made before them ('ideo'), and recorded for the information of the central authority. But the peculiarity of the entry is that it cannot be a transcript of an original return, for the words '*dicunt legati regis quod*' must obviously have been inserted at the time when Domesday Book itself was compiled. They ought to be compared with a passage in the Eastern Counties volume, where the Commissioners (though the fact may have escaped notice) appear to speak for themselves: '*Postea recuperavimus* dimidiam hidam' (ii. 2 *b*).

The question of the judicial power vested in the Domesday Commissioners is one, it must be admitted, of great nicety and importance. I would venture, therefore, to ask your patience for a slight *excursus* on the subject. I do so the more confidently because there is a record bearing directly on the question, which possesses for students of Domesday a quite unique interest, and which yet appears to have met with scarcely the attention it deserves. I refer to the

Worcestershire document printed in Heming's Cartulary, which reveals to us the four Domesday Commissioners to whom that circuit was entrusted actually in session, attended by their clerks. When we consider the scarcity, one might almost say the absence, of contemporary record evidence connected with the Domesday Survey, we must pronounce this document to be of extraordinary importance. It is headed 'Conventio inter Wulstanum episcopum ac Walterium Abbatem,' and describes itself as effected 'in the presence of Bishop Remigius, Henry de Ferrars, Walter Giffard, and Adam [*i.e.* Fitz Hubert] regis principibus, qui venerant *ad inquirendas terras comitatus*.' Further on in the document these Domesday Commissioners are referred to as 'barones regis,' and they with their clerks attest the 'conventio.' It is probably because Ellis does not describe this record that Mr. Freeman so strangely neglected it in his volume on the Conqueror's reign, though it is printed twice in Hearne's volume, which has been in the hands of antiquaries more than 160 years. Mr. Freeman made little or no use of the mine of information on his special period which this Cartulary affords. The oversight was, at the time, somewhat amazing, but fortunately Mr. Freeman must have noted these documents before the publication of his fifth volume a few years later.

Now let me explain the right sequence of these exceedingly precious documents as bearing on the Domesday Survey. We have first the actual writ of the Conqueror bidding Geoffrey, Bishop of Coutances, hold a *placitum* as his representative to determine a territorial question at issue between the Bishop of Worcester and the Abbot of Evesham, relative to the manors of Bengeworth and Hampton. Then we have, secondly, the *Commemoratio placiti*, or report of the *placitum* held accordingly (and a wonderful record it is). Thirdly, we have the writ of the Conqueror consequent on

the decision of this *placitum*, commanding that that decision should take effect. This last we may note is, curiously enough, entered twice over. We can date these proceedings as having taken place between 1077 (or rather 1079, though Mr. Freeman has failed to detect the fact) and 1082 (?), for they were subsequent to Walter becoming Abbot of Evesham, and previous to the Conqueror's return to England in 1082 (?); a fact which I prove from the *Commemoratio Placiti*, where it is specially mentioned that William was in *Normandy* when he issued the writ commanding the *placitum*, and despatching Geoffrey to hold it.

Lastly, passing to the date of Domesday, we have the formal document directed by Bishop Geoffrey himself to the four Domesday Commissioners in Eyre, bearing his 'testimonium' to the fact (presumably in answer to their inquiries) that he had duly held the above *placitum*, and informing them of the decision arrived at on that occasion.

It was after the receipt of this communication that the Bishop and the Abbot, in the presence of the Commissioners, came to an agreement on the point at issue.

Now remember that all this has nothing to do with the Domesday Commissioners' own inquest as to the privileges of the Liberty of Oswaldslawe, to which I shall refer below. Yet what do we find? Mr. Freeman, evidently misled by the sequence of the documents in print, jumbles up in hopeless confusion these two distinct transactions, the Commissioners' inquest on the Liberty of Oswaldslawe and Geoffrey's *placitum* in these two manors which was held years before. He first tells us (p. 763) that 'the court, the *placitum*, the scirgemot was held by Geoffrey, Bishop of Coutances,' and that it 'was doubtless held during the taking of the Survey,' which, as we have seen, was absolutely impossible, from the fact that it was held at a time when William was absent in Normandy, a fact which Mr. Freeman has carelessly overlooked. I must

protest against this incorrigible habit of using such a word as 'doubtless,' a habit which Mr. Freeman has severely reprimanded in one of the editors of the Rolls Series, and which, as he himself points out, is a fruitful parent of error. For my part, when I meet with the word 'doubtless' in any of Mr. Freeman's writings, my doubts are at once aroused. And observe the usual development. Before we have reached the bottom of the page hypothesis is converted into fact, and we are told that the 'Gemot' in which the *placitum* was held 'was actually a part of the Survey,' and again two pages further on (p. 765) that it was 'held during the progress of the Survey.' We are next informed that Geoffrey's communication 'was sent to the Commissioners for the very purpose of fixing the entry to be made in Domesday,' and that 'we see the result in p. 172 *b* of Domesday.' We see there nothing of the kind. What we see there is something entirely different, namely, the record of the Oswaldslawe inquest held by the Commissioners themselves. Last of all is placed by Mr. Freeman the Conqueror's writ consequent on the *placitum*, which was issued, as a matter of fact, years before the Survey.

I have felt it needful to go thus fully into these really important records in order to establish their right sequence, and to prove that Mr. Freeman may himself be wanting in that critical acumen, the absence of which in his predecessors he deplores at the outset of his book. That Dr. Stubbs should have passed over in his great work these precious and most instructive records is the more singular as he rightly dwells on the importance of that great *placitum* on Pennenden Heath, over which Bishop Geoffrey similarly presided, and to which this Worcestershire *placitum* presents so close a parallel.

But keeping to our point, it would seem from these records that the Commissioners in this contested case confined them-

selves to appealing to the Bishop's moderation and to patching up a compromise (*pactum*) by which the Bishop (*rogatu ipsorum*) was induced to abandon his claim. The question having been thus settled, the entries were made accordingly in the Survey.¹ It is curious, however, that the Survey contains no reference to this suit, though it does for one of the manors in dispute refer to another great Worcestershire *placitum* held also, like the well-known one in Cambridgeshire, not by Geoffrey of Coutances, but by Odo of Bayeux.

Before leaving, for this evening, Heming's Cartulary, I would call your attention to the fact that it contains besides an abbreviation of the Domesday Survey of the possessions of the church of Worcester, which abbreviation, by the way, might suggest the inquiry whether the existing 'Breviate' was the first of its kind, two distinct early Surveys which ought to be carefully noted. The first of these is a detailed Survey of three churches and some forty houses in Worcester (pp. 289-291). To this I assign a very early date. My ground for so doing is that the church of St. Helen is there entered as held by 'Fridericus,' and that 'Fridericus clericus' is one of the witnesses to the *conventio* discussed above, which was attested by the Domesday Commissioners. But as Frederic did not obtain St. Helen's till the death of Bishop Wulstan,² this Survey must, in any case, be ten years later than Domesday. We may date it as *circiter* 1100 A.D. The essentially English character of its nomenclature should be

¹ The two estates concerned were at Hampton and Bengeworth, members of the manor of Cropthorne (co. Worcester). As a result of this compromise, which settled the long controversy, we find them entered, it should be noticed, under the names of *both* the parties (i. 174, 175 *b*). Another peculiarity of the entry (i. 174) is this. Cropthorne is entered at 50 hides, of which only 40 are accounted for. This is explained in Heming's Cartulary by the fact that ten hides (in Hampton) of the 50 were free from geld. This is a somewhat suggestive circumstance as to the system here at least adopted in the compilation of the Survey.

² Whose chaplain he was (pp. 420, 425, 427).

carefully noticed. The other Survey is that of the episcopal Liberty of Oswaldslawe (pp. 313-316). This we may assign, from internal evidence, to the reign of Henry the First.

Lastly, I have a novel theory to advance on the most important 'Indiculum Libertatis de Oswaldeslawes Hundred que a toto vicecomitatu Uuireceastre sacramento jurisjurandi firmata est Willelmo seniore regnante.'¹ This document, as is well known, is entered in Heming's Cartulary, and has been printed both by Hearne and Ellis. In it we read that when the shiremoot had deposed to the privileges of the Bishop in the Liberty, the Commissioners 'in autenticâ regis cartulâ hoc testimonium scribi fecerunt,' and again that 'ad hujus rei confirmationem, exemplar ejus in autenticâ regis cartulâ, ut predixi, scriptum est, que in thesaur[o] regali cum totius Anglie descriptionibus conservatur.' The language of this exceedingly early document is, it will be seen, precise, and it is difficult no doubt, at first sight, to understand how it can mean anything but that an actual record (*cartula*) was separately preserved with Domesday Book. Yet observe that Domesday is here spoken of not by the usual term 'descriptio,' but as 'descriptiones.' If we are to understand by this plural form, not the two existing volumes, not even those once separate portions which related to the several counties, but the actual original returns themselves, then it becomes possible to explain this passage by taking the *cartula* to have been the record of a separate inquest in the shiremoot ('super hac re facta ab ipsis inquisitione'), which was first submitted to the king's approval, and then, its insertion having been sanctioned by him (if we may so render the words 'rege annuente' of

¹ This 'Indiculum' is, by inadvertence, described in the Catalogue of Domesday MSS. exhibited in the British Museum (at the Commemoration) as 'the Domesday Survey of the monastic lands in that hundred.' It is essential to remember that it is *not* this, but a separate inquest on the privileges of the Liberty.

the record), was inserted as we see it in Domesday Book in a quasi-separate form.¹

The view that in the 'descriptiones Angliæ' preserved 'in thesauro regali' we have the original returns themselves is confirmed by a very valuable passage in Henry of Huntingdon, who, after describing the Domesday Inquest ('Inquirere fecit,' etc.), adds: 'Hæc omnia in cartis scripta delata sunt ad regem et, inter thesauros reposita, usque hodie servantur.' Here we have direct contemporary witness to the preservation of the original returns (as distinct from Domesday Book) in the Treasury, that is, in Winchester Castle.² The 'cartula,' therefore, above referred to, would be preserved with these 'cartæ,' the same word, we may notice, which is used for the returns of knights' fees under Henry II.

If this explanation be correct, and I venture to think it is, it should surely prove of considerable importance, not only in this particular case, but also as applying to the similar cases of what I may term records of special inquests, as we see them embodied in the Survey.³ Good types of such a Record are those on the Customs of Berkshire (i. 56 *b*) and of Archonfield (i. 179).

The *conventio* attested by the Domesday Commissioners which has led me into this discussion should be compared

¹ On collating the version in the Cartulary with that contained in Domesday, they are found to be virtually identical, save that the clause 'nec aliquis regalis servitii exactor,' which is added as a marginal note in the Cartulary (though printed by Hearne in the body of the text), is not found in the Domesday version, and that the final clause, 'nec jura fecerat,' is also omitted. But the omission is of little, if any, importance.

² The question of the exact date implied by 'usque hodie' is complicated by the succession of editions of Henry of Huntingdon's work. If the words were true at the time of the latest, and had not been merely retained by inadvertence, their importance is all the greater.

³ By a singular error, Ellis prints (i. 19), as 'the list of Jurors for the Hundred of Oswaldeslaw' on this occasion, a list of names of the time of Bishop John, i.e. 1151-7). This is but one instance more of the way in which these documents in Heming's Cartulary have been misdated and misunderstood.

with the early and noteworthy *conventio quæ facta est coram multis testibus et divitibus hominibus* which we find recorded in the Burton Cartulary (p. 49) for which we are indebted to General Wrottesley, a member of our own committee. It is assigned by the learned editor to about 1115, that is within thirty years of Domesday, and if I had time I could show you how in this case the king's barons or *missi*, namely the Bishop of Chester and William Peverell, discharged much the same functions as the Domesday Commissioners in the above *conventio*.¹

I cannot leave this subject without alluding to another Kentish *placitum* mentioned *eo nomine* in Domesday (i. 2) as held by *barones regis* or pointing out that it is difficult in practice—I say advisedly in *practice*—to distinguish between sworn inquests and formal *placita*. The machinery was the same in both cases, namely the oath of the jurors.

On the whole the function of the Domesday Commissioners is, I take it, exactly described in the famous passage on the Liberty of Oswaldslawe (Ellis, i. 20)—‘*ad inquirendas et describendas possessiones et consuetudines.*’ I would ask you to observe how in the next century the justices itinerant continued to discharge this same function. Take for instance the ‘leges’ of Chester as set forth in the Domesday Survey, and compare them with the ‘leges et consuetudines’ of Newcastle on Tyne under Henry I. as set forth under Henry II. (‘Select Charters,’ 107). Then pass on to the charter granted by Richard I. to Colchester, and notice the remarkable closing clause (for I have never seen it noticed anywhere):—‘*sint fora et consuetudines in tali statu quali fuerunt confirmate juramento Burgensium nostrorum Colcestrie coram justiciis errantibus*

¹ We must remember that the functions of ‘*missi*,’ ‘*legati*,’ and justices in eyre would resemble each other in so far as each of these classes represented the special emissary of the king. ‘*Legatus*,’ however, is applied by Domesday to others besides the Commissioners for the Survey. ‘*Legati Regis*,’ indeed, are referred to under the Confessor (i. 377), and as officials strangely resembling justices in eyre.

domini regis patris nostri.' Whence we learn that at Colchester, as at Newcastle on Tyne, the local *consuetudines* must, under Henry II., have been thus established and set forth.

At the same time if the 'Invasiones' recorded in the Eastern Counties volume are admitted to have formed part of the Survey, then formal 'pleas' (*placita*) must have done so too. This I gather from such expressions as 'tamen erant in manu regis prius quam *hec* placita fierent' (ii. 99 *b*), 'non potuit venire in placitum' (ii. 449), of which the latter should be compared with 'nec aliquis eorum venit ad hanc descriptionem' (i. 164) for the contrast of 'placitum' and 'descriptio.' It should also be noticed that in this latter case the offender is pronounced to be 'in misericordia regis,' a technical phrase implying a trial of the case ('placitum').

But we must now return to the Chapter record. Notwithstanding that Peter's wrongful seizure of a portion of the manor was thus recorded in the Survey, this subsequent complaint of the Canons shows that he continued to withhold it. Now, the entry recording his aggression continues :—'De eodem manerio tulit Goisfridus de magna villa x acras prati.' As the detention of this meadow is not among the Chapter's complaints, we may assume that Geoffrey, unlike Peter, had either restored it since the Survey or had made some compromise such as we shall find was effected in a similar case. I was fortunate enough to come across the copy of a very curious record bearing on this 'invasio.' It is printed (from the 'Liber Pilosus,' fo. 5 *a*, among the St. Paul's Muniments) in the 'Gentleman's Magazine,'¹ and is as follows :

H. Episcopus R. de Valonio salutem. Testimonium porto² Canonicis de Sancto Paulo quod Petrus pater tuus moriens reddidit eis quandam hidam de terra quam injuste tenuerat quietam et sine

¹ N. S. xxxvii. 372.

² Compare the expression of the Bishop of Coutances (*supra*).

omni calumniâ apud Cingfort et egit inde penitenciam et quesivit absolucionem, presentibus Willelmo de Albineio et Willelmo filio suo et multis aliis instantibus et servientibus in morte sua.¹

I believe, however, that Roger de Valoynes refused to recognise his father's act in this death-bed restitution, and that the land seized by Peter was never recovered by the Chapter, though here again his heirs may have arranged to give some compensation.² My reason for that belief is this. The manor of Chingford, in the Survey, is assessed at *six* hides. The Canons in their complaint urge that they have not only been robbed by Peter, but that they have still to pay 'scotum et consuetudinem regis' on that portion of the estate which he has seized. Now, on turning to the *Inquisitio Maneriorum* of 1181 we learn that the manor, both then and in the time of Henry the First, was assessed at *five* hides.³ It follows that the Chapter had procured a re-assessment, in which the hide seized by Peter was deducted, so that they had no longer to pay 'scotum et consuetudinem' upon it. But indeed we have positive evidence on the point. For we find this same *Inquisitio* nearly a century after Domesday still complaining of the detention of this very hide:—'rutehidam quam occupatam detinet Robertus de Valoniis,' Robert being the grandson, says Archdeacon Hale, of the original culprit Peter. We may infer the same in the case of Tilwolditun, another of the Chapter's Essex manors. In was here that Ralph Baynard was entered as holding half a hide, whether rightly or wrongly the Hundred knew not. This aggression, it may be worth noting, is not

¹ The contributor of this document assigned it to Bishop Hugh, and consequently to 1075-1085. But the Bishop's initial must be wrongly given, for Peter did not die till the days of Henry I.

² It would seem that an interesting field of inquiry is presented by those manors which were said, in Domesday, to be held by a wrong or doubtful title, Clapham, for instance, which Geoffrey de Mandeville was alleged to hold 'injuste' but which he succeeded in retaining. An inquiry as to the fate of such manors might lead to valuable results.

³ Hale's *Domesday of St. Paul's*, p. 144.

mentioned in the Chapter's complaint, which would almost suggest that if the question had been tried, it had been decided against them. In any case they must here also have lost the land for good, since we find their assessment for the manor reduced under Henry the First by the amount of this half-hide.¹ Though Archdeacon Hale, in his valuable work, alludes to these reductions of assessment, he seems to have missed the point and failed to detect their explanation.² That the explanation I have given is correct, and that the same process was in full operation at, and probably before, the Survey, is clear from such a passage in Domesday itself as 'Tunc se defendebat pro III hidis, modo pro II hidis et dimidia, *quia in parco Rogerii Comitis est dimidia hida*' (i. 48 b-49). So too with the great Warenne manor of Niwerde:—'T.R.E. se defendebat pro LXXVII hidis et dimidiâ. Quando W. recepit nisi lviii hidis, *quia alie fuerunt intra rap' comitis Morit.*'

A very interesting record of a decision effecting a similar reduction of assessment is fortunately preserved, but is probably little if at all known. I therefore here quote it from some Battle Abbey Charters printed in a paper of Sir George Duckett ('Sussex Arch. Coll.' xxxi. 158) checked by Mr. Birch's transcript of the original.³ Here we have a writ from Henry the First to the Bishop of Chichester and the Reeves of Sussex, bidding them reduce the assessment of Alciston from 50 hides to 43:

Sciatis quod sicut Abbas de Bello et monachi dirationaverunt coram me quod non habent illas terras quas dicebatis eos habere, scilicet, Ovingdene, etc. . . que antiquitus pertinebant ad Alsistonam, et que faciunt septem hidas de quinquaginta hidis que jacent in Alsistona et in suis pertinentiis; sic præcipio quod a modo inde liberi sint et quieti, nec aliquis eis in amplius molestus sit, sed sint ab his terris et his hidis liberi et quieti, sicut de illis quas nec habent nec inde seisisi sunt.

¹ *Ibid.* p. 142.

² *Ibid.* pp. xii-xiii.

³ *Journ. Brit. Arch. Ass.* xxix. 257.

This should be compared with the Domesday entry, that, in the Confessor's day,—

Defendebat se pro *L* hidis et modo pro *XLIII* hidis et dimidia. . . De his hidis jacent *III* hidæ et dimidia in Rapo de Hastings, et *II* hidæ in Rapo de Lewes (i. 17 *b* [2].

The passage is obscure, but one is tempted to believe that the $5\frac{1}{2}$ hides here enumerated must have been those which constituted the difference between the 50 hides and the $44\frac{1}{2}$.

Another point which will doubtless be noticed is that in both the above cases the aggressions are spoken of in terms of the hide. This is a more difficult point than might at first sight appear, for if the hidage of a manor, as Mr. Eyton held, represented not area but its assessment, it is hard to see what area, if any, would be denoted by a hide or fraction of a hide, unless the area in question happened to be separately assessed at that amount. As I shall discuss this point in another Paper, I will merely observe that the hide here in question had not only a separate existence but a distinct name of its own.

Lastly we should notice the name here given to the Survey, viz. 'Descriptio Angliæ,' observing that 'Descriptio' is also the name by which it speaks of itself in its own colophon as well as in other places, that Ordericus Vitalis speaks of it as 'totius Angliæ descriptio,' that in the Gloucester Cartulary we similarly read 'in descriptione totius Anglie,' and that in the 'Dialogus' (i. 16) it is similarly styled 'totius terræ descriptio.' Moreover, a notable charter of the Conqueror is dated 'Post descriptionem totius Anglie' (Madox's 'Formularium,' cccxcvi). I would take this opportunity of pointing out that though Ellis speaks of this charter as 'sufficient evidence of the importance which William himself attached to the completion of the Survey' (i. 349), in which

he probably follows Webbe who urges that it implies an intention of the Conqueror 'to have made the completing of it the commencement of a new era' (p. 6), yet I doubt if anything more was intended than to date the grant as subsequent to Domesday, and so to explain its non-appearance in the Survey.

The three other aggressors enumerated in the Canons' complaint, Ralph de Marcey, Otho the goldsmith, and Herbert the chamberlain, are all Domesday tenants, though, in their case, the aggression complained of cannot be identified in the Survey. Their doings, however, are worth glancing at, as they may cast some instructive side light on the language of the great Record.

Ralph de Marcey is the first offender. In the Survey he appears only as an under-tenant in Essex and Suffolk, and is not mentioned in connection with the holdings of the Dean and Chapter. But here we read as follows :

Radulfus de Marceio [1] comparavit j hydam terræ de uno villano nomine Iiveri de Nasestochâ Sancti Pauli manerio contradicente conventu canonicorum, et [2] cum ista invasit dimidiam hydam, quæ fuit Sevul cujusdam villani ejusdem manerii, [3] similiter fecit de terra Edwini, Winimi, et [4] terrulas circa manerium mordendo ille avidus occupavit. Adhuc autem [5] dimidium nemus eis abstulit.

This charge is composed, it will be seen, of five distinct clauses. We may note, moreover, the varying terms 'comparavit,' 'abstulit,' 'occupavit,' which should be compared with the Domesday *formulæ* for cases of contested possession.

Though the entry in the Survey relating to Nastock is peculiarly long and complicated, owing to the number of holdings into which it had previously been divided, there is no mention of Ralph de Marcey. It would seem then that his aggressions were subsequent to Domesday, and represent a continuance of that grasping policy of which the traces are

so conspicuous throughout the Survey. But the peculiar interest of Ralph's aggressions lies not so much in their later date as in the compromise by which they were eventually settled. The record of that compromise is fortunately preserved, and (possibly from inadvertence) is printed twice, once in English (p. 31 *b*), and once in Latin (p. 66 *a*), in the Deputy-Keeper's valuable report on the Historical MSS. of the Chapter. In the first of these passages it is assigned the date of 'about 1127.' This date is demonstrably wrong, for among the witnesses is Otuel fitz Coun, who was drowned in the White Ship (1120). As he appears to have been in Normandy for some time previous, its date must be earlier still. In any case, it was William the son of our Ralph who made this compromise with the Canons, and its gist was that he should be allowed to hold all the lands at Navestock which his father had held at his death, on payment of an annual sum of sixteen shillings.

There must have been, however, a further arrangement which is not mentioned here, relative to the share of the hidage at which the manor was assessed, for which the De Marceys should be responsible. Now this is an interesting point. We have already glanced at two instances in which the hidage of the Chapter's manors was reduced by the crown *pro rata* in consequence of their extent being diminished; we have now an instance of the same process being effected by private arrangement. The De Marceys, we shall find, undertook to be responsible for one of the eight hides at which the manor was assessed. That is to say, the Canons, or rather their *firmarii*, continued to pay to the crown on an assessment of eight hides, but the De Marceys undertook to be responsible for one eighth of the amount.¹ Hence the

¹ By a similar arrangement in a different matter, on King Stephen transferring to St. Mary Magdalen's Hospital, Colchester, 18 acres of the crown demesne, which had previously been farmed by the burgesses, the Hospital took upon itself a liability of 3s. 5d. towards the annual *firma*.

firmarii who leased Navestock in 1152 specially stipulated with the Dean and Chapter that Ralph de Marcey, the then holder, should be made to pay not only his quitrent, but also his share of the crown dues.¹ Hence also we read in the survey of 1222 :

Willelmus de breaute cum herede et filia Radulfi de marci tenet j hidam terre pro xvi solidis per annum et consuevit defendere eam versus regem.²

It may perhaps be inferred from this entry that the original Ralph retained possession of the hide which he is described as 'acquiring' (*comparavit*), but had eventually to make restitution to the Chapter of the lands which they charge him with seizing. His *comparatio* was probably an offence similar to that recorded in Domesday where Earl Godwine is charged with buying a manor belonging to the Bishop of Rochester from two of his tenants, 'eo ignorante.'

As to the hidage of this manor, Archdeacon Hale asserts that 'there was an increase of seven to eight hides' between the compilation of Domesday and the surveys contained in his work.³ This, however, is not so. A careful analysis of the Domesday entry reveals a total hidage of $8\frac{5}{6}$ hides ($4\frac{5}{6} + 1\frac{1}{3} + 2 + \frac{2}{3} = 8\frac{5}{6}$). But of this, two-thirds of a hide was then in the king's hands. If then the Chapter failed to regain it, their total hidage would have been only $8\frac{1}{6}$ hides, which brings us very close to the 8 hides at which we find it assessed under Henry I. and subsequently.

The next offender is Otho the goldsmith, a Domesday tenant of some note. He it was, it may be remembered, who was subsequently appointed to construct the shrine over the Conqueror's grave. His descendants appear to have succeeded him as hereditary keepers of the dies, and there are charters

¹ *Domesday of St. Paul's*, p. 133.

² *Ibid.* p. 75.

³ *Ibid.* p. xii.

among the *Cartæ Antiquæ* in favour, it would seem, of himself and his son. The passage relating to him runs thus :

Otto aurifaber terras infra civitatem canonicis aufert et ij hydas cum nemore extra civitatem de quibus pater ejus canonicis per annum de soluto censu x solidos reddebat, et has terras dederat Eadwardus de hac urbe civis super altare Sancti Pauli tempore Regis Eadwardi et Regis Willelmi, cum quo finem de possessione sua fecerat, et uxor ejus quamdiu vixit quoque anno x solidos reddidit. Et mortua illa Sanctus Paulus hereditare debuit, sed quia Otto senex eam uxorem duxit Sanctus Paulus amisit.

Præter istas aufert eis aliam terram quam Dirmannus dedit pro filio suo facto canonico.

This is in many ways a most interesting entry. In the first place, it introduces us to a form of tenure which existed at the time of the Survey, but of which no mention, I think, is made by Mr. Freeman or the other writers who have dealt specially with these subjects. Mr. Freeman, in an elaborate Appendix on Leases and Sales in Domesday, specially refers to the leases for three lives given by ecclesiastical corporations. But this is quite distinct. It springs from the surrender of lands to an ecclesiastical corporation, subject to the life interest of the grantor and his widow, during the continuance of which, however, the Church is to receive an annual rent. It will be found that Mr. Seebohm, in his great work on the 'Village Community in England,' assigns to this practice a high antiquity and a very considerable importance. He traces it through the laws of the Alamanni (622) from the Roman system itself (pp. 315-317), and describes those who had to surrender their lands as 'usufructuary tenants.' Though he does not, I think, allude to the working of this practice in England, we have cases of it at least as early as the reign (apparently) of Æthelstan, where Alfred the Thegn grants his estate at Stoneham to the new minster of Winchester, subject to the life-interests of himself and his wife. The Deputy-Keeper's

report on the Muniments of the Dean and Chapter teems with cases in point. I need only instance one which will be found in the same MS. (fos. 40, 40 *b*). where I cannot but think, though the fact is not recognised in the report, that the three charters there printed, one of which is in Anglo-Saxon, all refer to the same property, namely half a hide of land in the Chapter's manor of Sandon which Æthelward ('licheberd') surrendered to the Chapter (probably about the close of the eleventh century) subject to the life-interest of himself and his wife Leofgifu, who was a daughter of Colswegen and sister of Æthelmar, they paying for it in the meanwhile an annual tribute in money.

But there is something specially welcome in the glimpse which we are here given, not only of a piece of family history (Otho's father being previously unknown), but also of one of the ways in which the immigrant foreigners were provided for, and of those in which they transgressed. Here is an English citizen living under Edward the Confessor, evidently a man of considerable substance, who leaves land within the city and two hides without its walls to the Canons, on condition that his wife shall enjoy it for her life, subject to her paying them a tribute of ten shillings a year. She survives him, and, as a widow, is married to Otho the elder, who holds the property in her right, paying the Canons his yearly tribute. But his son and successor, Otho the goldsmith, refuses to give up the land when the life-interest has expired. His offence was aggravated by the fact that, from the dates, he must, if his father did not come into England till after the Conquest, have been his son by a previous wife.

This case ought to be compared with that of another Domesday tenant, William Goizenboded, as recorded in the Survey (i. 167). Ælfwine, a præ-Conquest sheriff of Gloucestershire, had been granted by the Confessor a life-estate in a certain property in Lower Guiting in that county. On his

death, the Conqueror 'dedit Ricardo cuidam juveni uxorem ejus et terram,' this follower being thus provided for in the same way as the elder Otho. Richard again was in turn 'succeeded' by William Goizenboded, who retained possession of the property at the time of Domesday, and continued indeed to do so after, to judge from the Gloucester fragment, though it had originally been only a life-estate, and though, like the younger Otho, he cannot even have been a son of the Englishwoman.

His detention of the lands which Deorman had given them 'when his son was made a Canon,' is a very suggestive entry, bringing him, as it does, into connection with a noteworthy Domesday tenant. It was formerly supposed that Derman of London, as he is termed in the Survey of Middlesex, was so styled to distinguish him from the Derman who occurs in the Survey of Hertfordshire among the king's English thegns. But the late Mr. Coote ingeniously argued from an Anglo-Saxon charter remaining at the Guildhall, and granted by the Conqueror to Derman as his 'man,' that the two tenants were one and the same. In any case the Derman of this record must have been identical with the Domesday Derman of London, whose descendants were clearly traced from the Clerkenwell Cartulary by Mr. Tomlin in the last generation, the same writer pointing out that Ælfgar, son of Derman, became a member of the Capitular body of St. Paul's, which Ælfgar, therefore, was the very Canon referred to in the record I am discussing.

The remaining offender is thus dismissed :

Herbertus camerarius fecit eis injuriam de una terra quam vicini testificantur esse Sancti Pauli.¹

¹ Compare the complaints of the monks of Abingdon against this Herbert : 'quanta vir ille contra ecclesiam ac abbatem machinatus est' (*Abingdon Cartulary*, ii. 134-5).

Here again the actual 'terra' cannot, I fear, be identified in the Survey, to which the aggression therefore may be subsequent, but the terms in which the witness of the district is appealed to are in close accordance with those of Domesday, as, for instance, in the case of Nastock—'hundret fert testimonium quod est Sancti Pauli' (ii. 13).

Summary of a + New View of the Beldable Unit of Assessment of Domesday.*

(*Ante*, vol. i. pp. 227-385.)

By O. C. PELL.

By desire I write a summary of the last paper in Vol. I. The letter P means the paper; the word 'Hultsch' means his 'Griechische und Romische Metrologie' (Berlin, 1882), and 'Cambist' means the 'Universal Cambist' by Kelly (2nd ed., London, 1831). The paper shows that the *real* 'virgæ' by which the *original* allotments of land were made in these islands are divided either decimally, duodecimally, or sex-decimally into divisions of different cubits, feet, or spithamæ without fractions, and that they often coincide with like divisions of the pounds, marks, or solidi of silver (P, pp. 297-316); that these feet of the virgæ often also coincide with the foot of the cloth ells (P, 328 *et seq.*), and sometimes the divisions of the land with the numbers, weights, and measures of the articles sown or rendered (*see* Swedish Tunna and Tunneland, 'Cambist,' pp. 330-1); that in some one of such divisions lies a clue as to who the ancient occupiers might be (pp. 229-250, 297-298). Thus the Battle Abbey pole of 16 feet statute is really a Norman measure of 15 pieds du roi of '325 m., and the acre of 60 × 600 and hide of 240 acres fit in with the Norman pound (pp. 271-5), and solve the difficulty there

NOTE.—This Summary is printed at the author's expense.—ED.

expressed. The only instance of the amount of a jugerum to be found in the United Kingdom is the short acre of Sussex of 100 stat. poles (see Table of acres, *post*), though the Lincolnshire customary acre (5 roods) is exactly a double jugerum. Again (Hultsch, pp. 349 *et seq.*), there have been dug up in Egypt from tombs of 2000 years before Christ measure-sticks on which are depicted—on the *same stick*—two different ells, the royal (of 7 palms), and a smaller (of 6 palms), which stood to the royal as 6 to 7. The Egyptian royal ell was '525 m., its lesser ell '450 m., which, treated (Hultsch, p. 94) as a sesquipedalis cubit, would give the foot of '300 m. (P, 289, Middelburg, Neuchâtel, Zürich, Prague). The Romans, however (Hultsch, p. 355), fixed or ascertained the existence of another Asiatic royal ell of '532-3 m., the lesser ell of which (six-sevenths) is our cubit of '456-7 m.; both ells treated as sesquipedales cubits give respectively feet of '3556 m. and '3048 m., the former being twelve-tenths of a pre-Roman foot (Swedish and East Friesland) used by the Romans ('2963 m.), and the latter our foot of '3048 m. Not only the Irish, Welsh, and English acres of 7840 square statute yards (P, 255, 262-3), but also the Irish Tircumhail and the Russian Dessetina (P, 265 383) are founded on these measures. But the Asiatics (Herodotus, ii. 106) did not (as the Greeks did) treat ells as sesquipedales, but divided them, as Dyvnmal and his Welsh (Cimmerii) divided this lesser ell or statute cubit, into halves or spithamæ of 3 palms = '2286 m. (P, 290) '*before the Saxons came to England*' (P, 279, 378-79). The statute cubit or ell, therefore, owes its presence in these islands, not to the Saxons, but to a people preceding both them and probably the Romans also. At P, p. 378, it is shown that the words 'feet,' 'spans' &c. are merely mathematical expressions, and need not necessarily coincide with actual feet &c. of a human body &c.; in the Ninth Report on Hist. MSS., p. 375, our cubit of a foot and a half (*i.e.* 18 inches) '457 m., is called a foot, and the Grecian

foot of '315 m. (the length of a Babylonian brick) is nine-tenths of the Egyptian foot of '350 m.; and so on. There is shown at p. 229 the *Roman unit or 'as'*: at p. 240 the *Irish Celtic weight*: and at pp. 230, 237, 239-241 the *Anglo-Saxon*, all *duodecimally* divided; at 230-32 the *Frank, Norman* and *Danish* (?) *decimally* divided unit; and, lastly, at pp. 233-34, 236-38, and 241-49, the *sexdecimal* division, and its component parts, of the *Mercian*. In the table on p. 248, and repeated *post*, will be seen in the manors of Latune and Herletune one half-hide taxed at 10s. 8d. Mercian, *i. e.* 128 denarii of 30 wheat grains = 120 Norman denarii of 32 grains. So too in the Appendix to ninth Report of the Commission on Historical MSS. (1883, p. 65), will be found (W. D. 2, f. 40) an isolated half-hide near London recorded in a Saxon grant as held by Ailward for VIII 'horen;' his wife succeeds him in 1103 at 'X solidos et VIII denarios,' and finally one Gallio takes it for 120 *Norman denarii*, and 24 more acres for 24 like denarii, being in all XII Norman solidi. (Note the Tower pound if of 5400 troy grains is to the troy pound as 15 to 16, as also are 120 to 128.)

The probability of a primary division of the land by chains and poles into blocks of stadia or quarantenes, and of the latter (pp. 258-59, 262, 264, 265, 269, 270-75, 286, 295-97) into acres, is shown with examples and reasons (P, 250-54). There is shown the decimal, duodecimal, and sexdecimal or binary nature of these blocks and poles and acres irrespective of stiffness of soil or the capacity of the oxen, with diagrams and explanations at pp. 254-60: at p. 260, the division of the acre by statute; at pp. 255, 258-59, 262 *et seq.*, 270-75, 286-88, 372-73, the nature of the *real* rod of whole numbers without *fractions*: and at pp. 286, 370-77, the size of acres, and the fallacy of supposing that the capacity of oxen or the stiffness of soil has anything to do with the shape or size. At page 371 the possible meaning of the Cornish

'acra' and 'ager' in D. B. is alluded to, and at page 278 that of the Cornish 'ferthing,' 9 of which made a Cornish 'ager' of 270 real acres (see Carew's 'Cornwall,' p. 110). Tables for assisting calculations are given at pp. 365, 375.

The part played by the adoption of an old or new foot in the division of the quarantene into acres is shown at pp. 259, 262-65, 269, 290-91, 292, and the resulting acres, and more particularly as to the Dyvnmal (or Cimmerian?) rods and spans or half-cubits, at 275-280, 287, 288-89, 290-94, 297-99, 300-3, 305. From P, 261 to 286, the divisions of the bigger units into acres are shown, and the following is a summary of all the known acres in these isles. Compare this with Tables of Virgates at p. 308, showing that the number of acres in the virgate followed the division into feet &c. in the pole or virga pp. 311-316. The statute foot is '3048 m. and sesquipedalis cubit '4572 m., the half of which is the span of '2286 m., or old British 'foot' on which the pre-Saxon measures are founded.

A square stat. pole is 25'2909 square metres.

A square stat. yard is '83612736 of a square metre.

A square stat. pole is 30'25 square yards.

The Continental 'Arpents' &c. have not long furrows like the above measure, but are built up on the lines of the 'plethra,' 'jugera,' and 'hæredia.'

Six \times 60 poles of feet in number $\frac{1}{3}$ less than the numbers in column P, = 4×40 of that column pp. 254-55: thus the stat. acre of $4 \times 40 \times 16\frac{1}{2} = 6 \times 60 \times 11$; but they sometimes treated a rod as 'bipedalis:' thus $3 \times 30 \times 22 = 6 \times 60 \times 11$: the statute acre in Jersey is so measured (Appendix Gov. Rep. of 1820, p. 26) and is in fact $3 \times 30 \times 24$ of the foot of '2794 m. This might prove a fertile source of error to those who suppose that an acre is necessarily built up of 4×40 of any named rod. So, too, the Devonshire acre is 90 square perches 20 statute feet long (*i.e.* $3 \times 30 \times 20$) and the West Somerset

Name of Acre	Stat. yards	Poles	Feet	Foot*	Vol. I, page	This solves the diff- { culty stated at p. 273 ; This is the Jersey foot.
Battle Abbey	455 $\frac{1}{2}$	4 x 40	16	3048	271-5	
Do. Norman Measure (pied du roi)	455 $\frac{1}{2}$	4 x 40	15	325	271-5	
Statute (20' 1168 m. x 201' 168 m.)	4840	4 x 40	18	12794	257, 382	
Normandy	9740 $\frac{1}{2}$	4 x 40	22	325	383	
Id.	9740 $\frac{1}{2}$	4 x 40	20	357	383	
Irish Plantation, Welsh, Westmoreland, Cumberland, } Guernsey, Lancashire, Northumberland, Yorkshire, } Derbyshire, (Hunts ?)	7840	4 x 40	18	3556	262, 282	
Wales	11776	4 x 48	20	357	268	
Cheshire, Staffordshire, Yorkshire, Leicestershire, Wales, } Ireland	10240	8 x 80	16	2286	274, 285-6, 382	
Merionethshire	2430	3 x 40	18	2286	292, 277, 255	
Anglesey, Somerset, Hants, Oxfordshire, Hereford, Car- } digian, Montgomery, Brecknock, Radnor, Sussex A }	3240	4 x 40	18	2286	285	
Irish (4 times A)	12960	4 x 40	36	2286	285	
In stat. cubits	4320	9 x 30	16	2286	294 or 300	
North Wales	5760	6 x 60	16	2286	279, 297, 304, 379	
Cornwall, Wilts, Devon, Lancashire, Wales.	25000	10 x 100	20	2286	379, 381	
Royal Forest (Sherwood)	4000	4 x 40	20	2286	276, 278, 382	
Devon arable, add ? <i>once all over England</i>	4800	4 x 48	20	2286	383, 269, 371	
West Somerset	9000	4 x 40	30	2286	286, 279, 383	
Lancashire	6084	4 x 40	18	3132	285, 372, 383	
Dumbarton	6104	4 x 40	18	3138	266	
Scotch	6150 $\frac{3}{4}$	4 x 40	18	3148	267	
Scotch	6050	4 x 40	18	3123	110 poles	
Lincolnshire	6050	20 x 20	12	2963	134 poles	
= <i>Hereidium</i> or 2 jugera	6250	6 x 60	20	2942	212 poles	
Cunningham	14951 $\frac{1}{2}$	4 x 40	18	3175	180 poles	
Ireland	9384	4 x 40	20	350	Jugurum 100 poles	
Wales	11264	4 x 48	20	350	120 poles	
Wales	2308 $\frac{3}{4}$	2 x 40	16	307	130 poles	
Leicestershire	3327 $\frac{1}{2}$	4 x 40	15	279		
Sussex (Osnaburg)	4053 $\frac{3}{4}$	4 x 40	15	3067	366	
Dorsetshire (Amsterdam)	6412	4 x 40	20	289	384	
Sussex (Bremen, &c.)	5445	6 x 60	12	2963	384	
Sussex and Hampshire	3025	10 x 20	12	2963		
Sussex and Wiltshire, $\frac{5}{6}$ of it <i>short</i> acre	3630	12 x 20	12	2963		
Sussex	3932 $\frac{1}{2}$	4 x 40	15	3026		
Irish forrach measure and Russian dessetina	13066 $\frac{2}{3}$	12 x 72	12	2963	265, 383	
"	13066 $\frac{2}{3}$	10 x 60	12	3553	265, 383	
"	13066 $\frac{2}{3}$	10 x 60	14	3048	265, 383	

* Foot in decimals of a metre.

is 108 (90 Anglico numero) of the like square perches (*i.e.* $3 \times 36 \times 20$). The decimal, duodecimal, and sexdecimal allotments called Virgates are dealt with (P, pp. 297-319). The ever-varying *areal* 'hida' or 'carucata' is discussed at pp. 319-326. The fixed geldable unit of assessment of Domesday is considered with examples at pp. 326-345, and at pp. 260, 346-350, are shown the principles on which the taxation proceeded. At pp. 350-360 is shown how the difficulty caused by the 'Anglicus Numerus' was met, with instances. And at pp. 360-363, under the head of 'Villanus,' are given reasons for supposing the population at Domesday to have been very much understated.

At pp. 321-23 are stated obvious reasons why the word 'car.' and 'carucata' as used in D.B. cannot always in every manor or even in the same manor mean the same thing. This cannot be otherwise in face of direct statements in D.B. in every county: such as that at Chenebalton in Huntingdonshire (D.B. fol. 205*b*), where there is said to be land for XX 'car.,' and at the same time and in the same paragraph the lord is stated to have V 'car.' and the tenants XXV 'car.'

In the counties of Devon and Cornwall we can test this to some extent by the 'Exon Domesday' (which appears to be the original return of the juries from which the Exchequer D.B. was compiled). In some cases the Exon D. gives the number of the lord's and the tenants' 'car.' and oxen which make up the *amalgamated* ploughs as stated in D.B., which latter car. of course in every case are therefore less in number than that of *unamalgamated* ploughs previously stated in D.B. The following is a list of some of them:—

Name	D.B.	Exon D.	Single 'Car.' for which there is terra D.B.	Such 'Car.' as re- turned in Exon D.		Joint 'Car.' as stated in D.B.
				Lord	Tenants	
Aissetona . .	122a	238	2	*	*	$\frac{1}{2}$
Woderon . .	122b	227	3	1	3 bov	$1\frac{1}{2}$
Bentewoin . .	124b	233	3	$\frac{1}{2}$	1 + 2 bov	2
Chilgoret . .	122a	216	1	2 bov	0	—
Treualla . .	124b	225	2	0	2 bov	—
Trewent . .	124b	203	6	$\frac{1}{2}$	1 + 2 bov	2
Pengalle . .	124b	225	1	2 bov	0	—
Trenant . .	124b	203	6	7 "	1	2
Cariorgol . .	123b	203	3	7 "	6 bov	2
Trescan . .	124b	204	3	1	1 "	1
Llanauuernec	124b	210	2	2 bov	2 "	$1\frac{1}{2}$
Drainos . .	124b	210	1	1 "	4 "	$\frac{1}{2}$
Treluga . .	124a	224	2	$\frac{1}{2}$	3 "	1
Torne . .	123a	212	1	0	2 "	—
Penquan . .	122b	212	1	3 bov	0	—
Trewiniel . .	124a	224	2	6 "	2 bov	1
Trelamar . .	124b	213	1	1 "	0	—
Linestoch . .	122b	228	5	1	6 bov	2
Avalde . .	124a	213	3	3 bov	3 "	1
Trewallen . .	123a	214	2	$\frac{1}{2}$	2 "	1
Treloen . .	123a	214	2	4 bov	0	$\frac{1}{2}$
Trethae . .	123a	214	2	1	3 bov	$1\frac{1}{2}$
Douenot . .	123a	214	1	4 bov	0	$1\frac{1}{2}$
Brethei . .	122b	227	4	1	4 bov	$1\frac{1}{2}$
Roshervet . .	123b	217	6	1	3 "	$1\frac{1}{2}$
Heia . .	124b	223	2	0	3 "	$1\frac{1}{2}$
Sanguilant . .	122b	218	3	2 bov	2 "	$1\frac{1}{2}$
Horniecota . .	123b	219	4	1	3 "	$1\frac{1}{2}$
Wertcote . .	123b	219	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	2 "	—
Roslet . .	123b	220	1	0	3 "	$\frac{1}{2}$
Lantmanuel . .	123b	220	4	1	3 "	$1\frac{1}{2}$
Lantcharet . .	123b	221	2	1	7 "	2
Disart . .	124b	223	1	$\frac{1}{2}$	1 "	$\frac{1}{2}$
Lisnewin . .	124b	222	2	$\frac{1}{2}$	3 "	$1\frac{1}{2}$
Argaulis . .	123a	229	3	3 bov	0	$1\frac{1}{2}$
Odenol . .	124b	235	2	5 "	1	$1\frac{1}{2}$
Tremor . .	122a	237	2	4 "	2 bov	1
Landelech . .	122b	240	5	5 "	$\frac{1}{2}$	1
Tregril . .	124b	243	7	2 "	2	2
Harestana . .	104b	201	2	$\frac{1}{2}$	4 bov	1
Widelfella . .	105a	191	2	1	1 + 2 bov	2

* '3 boves inter eum et bordarios suos' (Exon D.).

o means no car.

But 'seeing is believing,' and Mr. W. de Grey Birch in his 'Popular Account of Domesday Book' (published since my paper was written) at p. 219 et seq. directs his readers to MSS. where the sight can be obtained. I have thankfully veri-

fied his statements in regard to the different number of heads of draught cattle as shown actually at work at and not long after the time of the Norman Conquest. In the Bayeux Tapestry (see Mr. Fowke's work on it) there is shown the plough drawn by *one head*. In Cott. MS. Julius A vi. f. 3, the plough is shown as drawn by *two heads*. In Cottonian MS. Tiberius B v. part 1, f. 3, by *four heads*. In the Utrecht Psalter by *two heads*. In the Harleian MS. 603, 51 b, 54 b, of the date of the Norman Conquest, by *two heads*. In the Royal MS. 12 F XIII. f. 37, by *two heads*. In the Chronicon Roffense, Cott. MSS. Nero D II. 11 b by *two heads*. The above do not exhaust the list of MSS. where the like evidence can be obtained. For fuller and faithful description of the above carucæ see Mr. Birch's admirable book. Of course these heads of draught cattle when joined together would and did no doubt make at times bigger teams which would drag bigger ploughs either for the lord or an association of virgatarii.

Before I proceed to my additional matter I take the opportunity of correcting an error at page 230 of vol. i. The sentence commencing 'The Anglo-Saxons also in matters of account' should run thus: 'The Anglo-Saxons also in matters of account had originally a shilling of 72 grains, but after (not before) the advent of the Danes and the treaty between Alfred and Guthrum (referred to below) they appear to have divided the Treaty pound, which was one-fifteenth larger than the Tower pound, into shillings of six peninga, each penig being 20 grains Troy' &c. Six of these peninga would therefore equal the schilling of 5 peninga of 24 Troy grains of the treaty. (See Tables below.)

THE IDENTIFICATION OF ANCIENT AND
MODERN WEIGHTS, AND THE ORIGIN
OF 'GRAINS.'¹

In the last paper in Vol. I. of 'Domesday Studies,' being the paper written by me, I have shown how the *same* ancient square Stadium (answering to our modern quarantene) divided by different rods containing different numbers of feet, would give differently-sized acres, the sum total of which, however, would of course amount to the total area contained in the square Stadium, and I suggested that if known positive weights of metal, &c., were divided in the same way, the result would be that the divisions of the weights would in many cases correspond with the divisions of the Stadia into acres, &c. At pages 241 *et seq.* of that volume, and more particularly at p. 248, I show how an entry in Domesday Book itself at fol. 269*b*, in regard to the lands 'inter Ripam' being the *locus in quo* of the Cheshire acre of 6 × 60 sexdecimal rods of 16 feet, bears evidence of that fact. In it the Stadia or quarantenes are divided with a sexdecimal rod of 16 feet, and the pound itself is shown as divided sexdecimally into 16 solidi of 16 denarii, as well as into 12 solidi or ounces of 20 denarii, giving, however, in their *totals* exactly the same results (see *post*). I propose now to go somewhat deeper into the matter with regard to the weights; but as I go further back than the introduction of money, *i.e.* stamped metal, I do not intend to go into the relative value of gold and silver in different countries, but I have confined myself to weight, and merely remark that in some countries they have one weight for gold or silver and another weight for merchan-

¹ A Troy grain, or half chalcus, is .064,792 gramme. A gramme is 15.4340 Troy grains.

dise, and in other countries the same weight does duty for all three.

It is well known that in classical times in Asia, measurements were made by *original* Stadia of six hundred feet (*i.e.* 400 sesquipedales cubits), whatever the foot might be, this representing 60 decempedal rods. The whole Eastern system was founded on the basis of six into ten, but in after times (and it may be even at the same time) an original square Stadium of 600×600 was divided (without altering the total positive measurements, and instead of 60×600 ten times repeated) into 64×640 or 72×720 or 80×800 or 84×840 or 96×960 , that is, into duodecimal or sexdecimal divisions (4×16 , 5×16 , 6×16 , &c., or 5×12 , 6×12 , 8×12 , &c.) without increasing the actual area measured, the alteration being really in the size of the foot, the 4 of 15 in the sixty equaling and answering to the 4 of 16 feet of one-sixteenth less than the original foot, or, in other words, the rod of 15 feet of the one answering to the respective rods of the others, as shown at p. 255 of my paper referred to.

The chief weight among the Asiatics was the 'Talent' or 'total,' and as they divided the Stadium, whatever the length of it might be, thus 40×10 cubits, 60×10 feet, so did they divide the talent, whatever its positive weight might be (and there were many talents), into 60 minæ of 100 drachmæ each, of 6 obols of 8 chalci, and the following arrangement will show the divisions so made :

- 1 Talent = 480,000 chalci or 10,000 drachmæ, each of 48 chalci
- = 60 minæ each of 100 (larger, but called by me 'original') drachmæ
- = 6,000 drachmæ of 48 chalci
- = 36,000 obols of 8 chalci to obol
- = 18,000 aioboli of 16 chalci
- = 288,000 chalci.

Such was the original division of a talent in ancient times in certain parts of Asia. But perhaps at the same time, and certainly in after (but still ancient) times, these origina

talents were divided just as the Stadia were divided (instead of into 60) into 64, 75, 80, 84 and 96 minæ, and each of such minæ, if multiplied by *sixty*, would then be the foundation of another talent smaller than the original talent; thus, as we shall see, the Troy talent of 37,320 grammes, or 576,000 Troy grains, divided by 64 and the quotient multiplied by 60 gives the Tower talent of 34,987 grammes, or 540,000 Troy, so the Tower talent of 34,987 grammes divided by 64 gives the Asiatic talent of 32,744 grammes, or 505,300 Troy, the hundredth part of which is the Roman pound. So the Eginetan talent of 37,320 grammes, or 576,000 Troy, *i.e.* 100 Troy pounds divided by 75, gives the Babylonish of 497·6, thirty of which give 14,928 grammes, or the weight of one of the Babylonish stone ducks, or 480 ounces of the Troy pound, and so on.

We have distinct evidence of this in the statement of Plutarch (15), that Solon by adoption lowered the ancient weight by one-fourth. This he would have done by taking the new talent at 75 of the *original* drachma; in other words, as the *original* talent consisted of 60×100 , or 6,000 original drachmæ, it would consist of 80 ($\frac{6000}{75}$) of the new minæ (see *post*, forms Nos. 4, 5, 11, and 12, and notes thereto); but as we have seen above that a mina was 100 drachmæ, the *original* talent would consist also of (as well as of 288,000 *original* chalci) $80 \times 100 \times 48$, or 384,000 chalci, each, however, reduced one-fourth in size. Carrying on this investigation a step further, it will be observed that every one of these ancient talents was a centum-pondium or a hundredweight, consisting of 60 minæ of *one hundred* drachmæ, as well as 10,000 (100×100 drachmæ) (before divided into minæ).

If then an original talent was divided by 100, it would give a weight or pondus or pound of 100 drachmæ of 48 chalci, that is, 4800 chalci, or of $60 \times 1 \times 48$, that is, 2880 original chalci, or $80 \times 1 \times 48$ or 3840 reduced chalci, the sixty of the

one equalling the 80 reduced of the other, and so on with 64, 72, 84, 96. It is thus, and (it seems) thus only, that the number and weight of grains in any given pound (as I shall show) are to be accounted for, whether they be Roman siliquæ of 6 to the scripulum, Troy grains of 24 to the penny, or 'wheat' grains of 32 or 30 to the same: the siliqua being the double chalcus, and the Troy grain and the English wheat being the half chalcus, each, however, of different divisions of the same pound.

In the course of my searches I have become thoroughly convinced that to suppose that any known positive weight is to be arrived at by the multiplication of any number of a particular grain, say wheat, is a fallacy. A practical farmer well knows that the variation in a sack of wheat may be ten pounds, that is, five pounds either way, occasioned by the variation in seasons, let alone other causes of variation—so with the African carouba, the Roman siliqua and the lentes. Kelly says, p. 87: 'The weights and measures of India are extremely curious in the minuteness of their subdivisions. Thus the Ta is divided into a great number of twinklings of an eye, and the barleycorn into small seeds down to an atom of the sunbeam.' People have chosen to speak of 'grains' (as in 1266 in the Stat. 3 Ed. 51) as a measure of weight, and in our own country that statute declares the Norman penny to be 32 wheat-corns in weight 'medio spicæ,' but in Fleta, Book 2, c. 12, the Tower pound penny is said to be 32 grains of wheat 'mediocria,' the fact being that 30 of the former equal 32 of the latter in estimation. But these wheat-corns, on examination, as will be seen *post*, are really 32 half chalci of a determinate weight, and the absurdity of it more fully appears in the *absolute* exactness in the *same* weight in different countries thousands of miles apart; thus the Tripoli weight is absolutely the same as our Troy (see *post*, No. 50), and it is stated to be founded on the weight of a bean, ours, however, on 32 wheat-

grains! It certainly is wonderful how the two weights should have been preserved absolutely accurate, and the remark applies to the Swedish and Madras weight, each of 3'401 grammes, and other cases. Further on in this paper will be found the examination of known positive weights. These positive weights I have got from the Reports of the British Consuls abroad, made early in this century, by order of our Government in regard to Foreign Standards duly verified. The results of these reports are collected in Kelly's 'Universal Cambist,' London, 1831, being a most valuable book. The British Consuls in many cases report the number of 'grains' in the positive weight they are speaking of. When they do so, I place the number so reported immediately below the name of the place using the weight, and it will be seen that in *every case* they are deduced from the old Asiatic form of 48 chalci to the drachma, and not at all from the vegetablegrains, which at best can only afford a rough and ready method of calculation. See particularly Nos. 22, 23, 31, 51, 82, and the note after No. 80, *post*.

As it will be most convenient to show these divisions of the talent into 60, 64, 72, 80, 84, 96 minæ, so that they can be referred to as forms, the following tables represent them, and to them I shall constantly refer.

But I must remark that the ancient Egyptians divided their weights in a different way; it was a binary or joint sex-decimal and decimal system, *i.e.* :

2 × 10 × 10 etc.	32 × 10 × 10 etc.
4 × 10 × 10 etc.	40 × 10 × 10 etc.
8 × 10 × 10 etc.	48 etc.
16 × 10 × 10 etc.	64 etc.
24 × 10 × 10 etc.	72 etc.

and so on.

Talent = 1200 ounces, or 10,000 of its own drachmæ of 48 chalci.

No. 1	T (24,000 dioboli of 12 chalci = 18,000 dioboli of 16 chalci.)	= 60 original (see <i>ante</i>) minæ of 20 original ounces. 6,000 original drachmæ of 48 chalci. 36,000 original obols of 8 chalci. 48,000 obols of 6 chalci instead of 8 chalci. 18,000 original dioboli of 16 chalci. 24,000 dioboli of 12 chalci, instead of 16 chalci. 288,000 original chalci, 144,000 double chalci, 576,000 half chalci, and $1\frac{1}{2}$ minæ = 864,000 half chalci.
No. 2	$\frac{T}{64}$ (25,600 dioboli of 12 chalci = 19,200 of 16 chalci).	= 64 reduced minæ of $18\frac{3}{4}$ original ounces = 60 original minæ. ¹ 6,400 reduced drachmæ of 48 reduced chalci. 38,400 reduced obols of 8 reduced chalci. 19,200 reduced dioboli of 16 reduced chalci. 307,200 reduced chalci, 153,600 double chalci, 614,400 half chalci.
No. 3	$\frac{T}{72}$ (28,800 dioboli of 12 chalci or 6 siliquæ = 21,600 dioboli of 16 chalci).	= 72 reduced minæ of $16\frac{2}{3}$ original ounces = 60 original minæ. 7,200 reduced drachmæ of 48 reduced chalci. 43,200 reduced obols of 8 reduced chalci. 21,600 reduced dioboli of 16 reduced chalci (siliquæ). 345,600 reduced chalci, 172,800 double chalci, 691,200 half chalci.
No. 4	$\frac{T}{75}$ (24,000 dioboli of 30 half chalci = 24,000 of 32 of No. 5).	= 75 reduced minæ of 16 original ounces = 60 original minæ. ² 7,500 reduced drachmæ of 48 reduced chalci. 45,000 reduced obols of 8 reduced chalci. 36,000 reduced obols of 10 reduced chalci. 22,500 reduced dioboli of 16 reduced chalci. 18,000 reduced dioboli of 20 reduced chalci. 360,000 reduced chalci, 180,000 double, 720,000 half chalci.
No. 5	$\frac{T}{80}$ (24,000 dioboli of 32 half chalci = 256 dioboli of 30 half chalci).	= 80 reduced minæ of 15 original ounces = 60 original minæ. ³ 8,000 reduced drachmæ of 48 reduced chalci. 48,000 reduced obols of 8 reduced chalci. 24,000 reduced dioboli of 16 reduced chalci. 384,000 reduced chalci, 192,000 double chalci, 768,000 half chalci.

¹ A mina and a half = 921,600 half chalci. Twenty ounces = 10,240 half chalci.

² As all these several divisions equal 60 original minæ, therefore No. 4 divided into 15 ounces or units each of 5 of these reduced drachmæ = 16 ounces or units of 5 of the reduced drachmæ of the next division, No. 5, because 75 is to 80 as 15 is to 16.

³ See ² above.

No. 6	$\frac{T}{84}$ <p>(288,000 dioboli of 14 chalci = 25,200 dioboli of 16 chalci).</p>	<p>= 84 reduced minæ of 14 original ounces = 60 original minæ. 8,400 reduced drachmæ of 48 reduced chalci. 50,400 reduced obols of 8 reduced chalci. 57,600 reduced obols of 7 reduced chalci. 25,200 reduced dioboli of 16 reduced chalci. 28,800 reduced dioboli of 14 reduced chalci. 403,200 reduced chalci, 201,600 double chalci, 806,400 half chalci.</p>
No. 7	$\frac{T}{96}$ <p>(288,000 dioboli of 16 chalci).</p>	<p>= 96 reduced minæ = 60 original minæ. 9,600 reduced drachmæ of 48 reduced chalci. 57,600 reduced obols of 8 reduced chalci. 28,800 reduced dioboli of 16 reduced chalci. 460,800 reduced chalci, 230,400 double chalci, 921,600 half chalci.</p>
No. 8	$\frac{T}{100}$ <p>Divided as follows, <i>i.e.</i> (240 dioboli of 12 chalci or 24 half chalci, or 180 dioboli of 32 half chalci).</p>	<p>= 1 pound of 12 ounces. 100 drachmæ of 48 chalci. 60 original drachmæ of 48 chalci. 360 original obols of 8 chalci. 480 obols of 6 chalci instead of 8 chalci. 180 original dioboli of 16 chalci. 240 dioboli of 12 chalci, instead of 16 chalci. 2,880 original chalci, 1,440 double chalci, 5,760 half chalci. A pound and a half = 8,640 half chalci ; a pound and a third, or sixteen ounces = 7,680 half chalci ; a pound and a fourth, or fifteen ounces = 7,200 half chalci ; three-quarters of a pound = 4,320 half chalci.</p>
No. 9	$\frac{100}{100} = \frac{P}{64}$ <p>(256 dioboli of 24 half chalci or 192 dioboli of 32 half chalci).</p>	<p>Pound of 12 ounces. 64 reduced drachmæ of 48 reduced chalci. 384 reduced obols of 8 reduced chalci. 512 reduced obols of 6 reduced chalci. 192 reduced dioboli of 16 reduced chalci. 256 reduced obols of 12 reduced chalci. 3,072 reduced chalci, 1,536 double chalci, 6,144 half chalci. 16 ounces would be 8,192 of these half chalci, and $1\frac{1}{2}$ pound of 9,216 half chalci, eight ounces of 4,096 half chalci, and twenty ounces of 10,240 half chalci.</p>
No. 10	$\frac{T}{100} = \frac{P}{72}$ <p>(288 of 12 chalci or 24 half or 216 dioboli of 16 chalci).</p>	<p>Pound of 12 ounces. 72 reduced drachmæ of 48 reduced chalci. 432 reduced obols of 8 reduced chalci. 216 reduced dioboli of 16 reduced chalci. 3,456 reduced chalci, 1,728 double chalci, siliquæ 6,912 half chalci. A pound and a half = 10,368 half chalci, and 16 ounces 9,216 half chalci, and 8 ounces 4,608, and 15 ounces 8,640 half chalci ; 20 ounces are 2,880 siliquæ or double chalci, or 11,520 half chalci.</p>

No. 11	$\frac{T}{100} = \frac{P}{75}$ <p>(240 dioboli of 30 half chalci or 240 dioboli of 32 of No. 12). * Note, 75 is to 80 as 30 is to 32.</p>	<p>Pound of 12 ounces.</p> <p>75 reduced drachmæ of 48 reduced chalci. 450 reduced obols of 8 reduced chalci. 480 reduced obols of $7\frac{1}{2}$ reduced chalci. 225 reduced dioboli of 16 reduced chalci. 240 reduced dioboli of 15 reduced chalci. 3,600 reduced chalci, 1,800 double chalci, 7,200 half chalci = 7,680 of No. 12 (see note 1), 15 ounces are 9,000 half chalci, 16 ounces 9,600 half chalci, 8 ounces 4,800 half chalci, and a pound and a half 10,800 half chalci.</p>
No. 12	$\frac{T}{100} = \frac{P}{80}$ <p>(240 dioboli of 32 half chalci or 256 of 30 half chalci. See Note * above.)</p>	<p>Pound of 12 ounces.</p> <p>80 reduced drachmæ of 48 reduced chalci. 480 reduced obols of 8 reduced chalci. 512 reduced obols of $7\frac{1}{2}$ reduced chalci. 240 reduced dioboli of 16 reduced chalci. 256 reduced dioboli of 15 reduced chalci. 3,840 reduced chalci, 1,920 double chalci, 7,680 half chalci. 8 ounces of this would be 5,120 half chalci, and 16 ounces 10,240 half chalci, 18 ounces 11,520 half chalci. See Note * above in No. 11.</p>
No. 13	$\frac{T}{100} = \frac{P}{84}$ <p>(288 dioboli of 14 chalci or 252 dioboli of 16 chalci.)</p>	<p>Pound of 12 ounces.</p> <p>84 reduced drachmæ of 48 reduced chalci. 504 reduced obols of 8 reduced chalci. 576 reduced obols of 7 reduced chalci. 252 reduced dioboli of 16 reduced chalci. 288 reduced dioboli of 14 reduced chalci. 4,032 reduced chalci, 2,016 double chalci, 8,064 half chalci. A pound and a half = 12,096 half chalci, 15 ounces 10,080 half chalci, 16 ounces 10,752, 18 ounces 12,096 half chalci.</p>
No. 14	$\frac{T}{100} = \frac{P}{88}$ <p>(288 dioboli of 32 reduced half chalci.)</p>	<p>Pound of 12 ounces.</p> <p>96 reduced drachmæ of 48 reduced chalci. 576 reduced obols of 8 reduced chalci. 288 reduced dioboli of 16 reduced chalci. 4,608 reduced chalci, 2,304 double chalci, 9,216 half chalci.</p>

¹ Note.—As all these divisions equal a pound, therefore 15 units of 5 of these reduced drachmæ of 48 reduced chalci of form 11 = 16 units of the next (No. 12) division of 5 reduced drachmæ of 48 reduced chalci of that division, and it is owing to this consideration that the entry in Domesday 'inter Ripam' is capable of explanation, and is as I have explained by the entries in Domesday Book inter Ripam. I reproduce the explanation at the end of these forms, showing how 240 (7,200 of division 11 divided by 30) of 32 half chalci of division 12 must therefore equal 256 (7,680 of division 12 divided by 30) of 30 of that division.

No. 15	$\frac{T}{120} =$	<p>A pound and a half = 13,824 half chalci. 15 ounces = 11,520 half chalci. 16 ounces = 12,288 half chalci, 6,144 chalci. 8 ounces = 6,144 half chalci.</p> <p>Pound of 10 <i>original ounces</i> or 100 drams. 100 drachmæ of 48 chalci = 4,800 chalci. 600 obols of 8 chalci. 300 dioboli of 16 chalci. 1½ pound would be 7,200 chalci.</p> <p>Of course this pound might be divided as the hundredth part of a smaller talent (consisting of 1,000 ounces instead of 1,200), just as in any one of the above pounds (see Nice, <i>post</i>, 29, and Barcelona, No. 81). Priscianus has a passage in his <i>Liber de figuris numerorum</i> as follows: 'Idem Livius in xxxviii ab urbe condita ostendit magnum talentum Atticum octoginta habere libras et paulo plus cum supra dictorum computatio manifestet octoginta tres libras et quatuor uncias habere talentum quod est sex milia denariorum.' $12 \times 83 + 4 = 1,000$ ounces.</p>
No. 16	$\frac{T}{100} =$	<p>Pound of 100 drachmæ or 4,800 chalci. (Egyptian.)</p> <p>4,800 = pound. 6,000 = 1¼ pound. 6,400 = 1½ pound. 7,200 = 1⅔ pound. 8,000 = 1⅞ pound. 9,600 = 2 pounds. 12,800 = 2⅔ pounds.</p> <p>And so on; but it is to be observed that any one of the above divisions might be taken as the foundation of a new weight as with the former forms.</p>

Explanation of the Entry 'inter Ripam' in Domesday, referred to Forms 11 and 12, ante.

We have in Domesday Book itself, relating to the Survey of that part of Mercia lying between the Ribble and the Mersey, the returns showing the number of carucæ that there went to a hide and their 'valets' at the time of Edward the

Confessor, as sent in by the respective officers of 30 different manors.

These 'valets' are there sometimes stated in Norman currency of 12 ounces or oræ of 20 denarii to the pound, and in others in the Mercian currency, tallying exactly with the foregoing forms, *i.e.* that which gives 240 pence of 32 half chalci of Form 12, and also 256 denarii, *i.e.* 16 oræ or solidi of 16 pence of 30 half chalci of Form 12 to the pound or mark; but there is a general statement made by the Domesday Exchequer scribe applying to all these manors carucæ and the thains who owned them to be found at the head of the second column of fol. 269*b*, Domesday Book, running thus: '*Omnes isti taini habuerunt consuetudinem reddere ii oras denariorum de unaquaque caruca*,' being the summing up of the whole in one uniform money.

I have extracted from Domesday Book and placed in the next table below the manors to which the recital refers, their carucæ and their valets as stated in Domesday Book, placing in adjoining columns such valets in Norman and Mercian currency, the figures in brackets being mine. As the valet for one car. is stated to be 32 denarii or 2 ores, it follows that each Mercian ora or solidus contained 16 denarii, as at Pampesuuorde in Cambridgeshire (Hamilton's 'Inq. Com. Cant.' p. 38). We learn also from the valets of Latune and Hirleton, where half a hide is put at 10 sol. and viii. denarii (128 pence), that there must have been *four* car. in half a hide (4×32) or *eight* in a whole one; the valet therefore for a whole hide was 256 Mercian pence or one mark, equalling, as shown in the subjoined table in other entries, one Norman pound of 240 pence. This recital of Domesday Book refers to manors, lands, and carucæ as they were in the time of Edward the Confessor when held by Roger Pictavensis: the statement of the same lands and the re-arranged carucæ working thereon, when held by the grantees of Roger at the

1 hide = 256 acres, *i.e.* 8 virgates of 32 acres = 16 bovates of 16 acres.

Single car. = 32 ,, 1 ,,

*Double car. = 64 ,, 2 ,,

Norman, 240 den. to pound, 20 sol. to pound, 12*d.* to sol., 32 grains to den.

Mercian, 256 ,, 16 ,, 16*d.* ,, 30 ,,

Name of Manor	No. of Hides	No. of 'Car'	'Valet' T. R. E. as stated in D. Bk.	Troy FORM 12. Norman Value in Denarii (32 wheat grains to den.)	Tower FORM 12. Mercian Value in Denarii (30 wheat grains to den.)	No. of Grains	The 'Valet' stated in
Hitune .	1	4*	20 sol.	240	256	7,680	Norman money
Stochestede .	($\frac{3}{16}$) 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ virg.	(1 $\frac{1}{2}$) 4	4 ,,	45	48	1,440	Mercian ,,
Sextone .	1	(8) 16	16 ,,	240	256	7,680	,, ,,
Chirchedele .	($\frac{1}{2}$) 1	(4) 10	10 ,,	120	128	3,840	Norman ,,
Liderlant .	($\frac{1}{2}$) 1	(4) 8	8 ,,	120	128	3,840	Mercian ,,
Hinne .	($\frac{1}{2}$) 1	(4) 8	8 ,,	120	128	3,840	,, ,,
Torentum .	($\frac{1}{2}$) 1	(4) 8	8 ,,	120	128	3,840	,, ,,
Mele .	($\frac{1}{2}$) 1	(4) 8	8 ,,	120	128	3,840	,, ,,
Uluentune .	($\frac{1}{2}$) 1	2	64 den.	60	64	1,920	,, ,,
Esmedune .	($\frac{1}{2}$) 1	1	32 ,,	30	32	960	,, ,,
Alretune .	($\frac{1}{2}$) 1	(4) 8	8 sol.	120	128	3,840	,, ,,
Spec .	($\frac{1}{2}$) 1	2	64 den.	60	64	1,920	,, ,,
Cildrunelle .	($\frac{1}{2}$) 1	(4) 8	8 sol.	120	128	3,840	,, ,,
Wilbaldeslei .	($\frac{1}{2}$) 1	2	64 den.	60	64	1,920	,, ,,
Vuetone .	($\frac{1}{2}$) 1	1	30 ,,	30	32	960	Norman ,,
Wauretreu .	($\frac{1}{2}$) 1	2	64 ,,	60	64	1,920	Mercian ,,
Boltelai .	($\frac{1}{2}$) 1	2	64 ,,	60	64	1,920	,, ,,
Achetun .	($\frac{1}{2}$) 1	1	32 ,,	30	32	960	,, ,,
Fornebei .	($\frac{1}{2}$) 1	4	10 sol.	120	128	3,840	Norman ,,
Emuluesldel .	($\frac{1}{2}$) 1	2	64 den.	60	64	1,920	Mercian ,,
Hoiland .	($\frac{1}{2}$) 1	2	64 ,,	60	64	1,920	,, ,,
Daltone .	($\frac{1}{2}$) 1	1	32 ,,	30	32	960	,, ,,
Schelmeresdele	($\frac{1}{2}$) 1	1	32 ,,	30	32	960	,, ,,
Erengemeles	($\frac{1}{2}$) 1	(4) 2*	8 sol.	120	128	3,840	,, ,,
Otegrimele .	($\frac{1}{2}$) 1	(4) 10	10 ,,	120	128	3,840	Norman ,,
Latune .	($\frac{1}{2}$) 1	(4) 10	10 sol. 8 <i>d.</i>	120	128	3,840	Mercian ,,
Herletune .	($\frac{1}{2}$) 1	(4) 10	10 sol. 8 <i>d.</i>	120	128	3,840	,, ,,
Melinge .	($\frac{1}{2}$) 1	(4) 2*	10 sol.	120	128	3,840	Norman ,,
Bartune .	($\frac{1}{2}$) 1	1	32 den.	30	32	960	Mercian ,,
Heleshall .	($\frac{1}{2}$) 1	(4) 2*	8 sol.	120	128	3,840	,, ,,
Total .	11 $\frac{11}{16}$	93 $\frac{1}{2}$	pence .	2,805	2,992	—	{ 2,992 ac. = 93 $\frac{1}{2}$ car. of 32 acres to car. = 1 virg. { 11 $\frac{11}{16}$ hides of 256 to hide
„ .	—	—	grains .	89,760	89,760	89,760	

time of Domesday Book, is placed later on in the same folio, and shows different carucæ and uniform valets in Norman money. It has been seen that by the valets one hide by custom would pay 256 pence (8×32); supposing then that 32 Mercian pence represented the payment for a virgate (and we know that it did from the entry in regard to Stochestede, where a virgate and a half is valued at 4 sol., *i.e.* 3 Mercian solidi of 16 pence each, or 4 solidi of 12, *i.e.* in all 48 pence), it follows that there were 8 virgates in a hide each valued at 32 Mercian pence per virgate; this at one penny per acre would give 16 acres to the bovat, 32 to the virgate, and 256 to the hide or pound paying unit. I call the half chalci 'wheat grains' because they are so called in the stat. of Edward and by Fleta.

The antiquity of the division of the pound, or 100th part of the talent, into 256 denarii, according to Form 12, is shown by the ancient laws of Wales ('Record Commission,' 1841, p. 90; 'Venedetian Code,' Book II. c. xvii.), being a MS. written long before 1080, but containing the ancient laws of Wales, said to have been collected and compiled by Howel-dda in or about the year 743, and in *it* we find that Dyvnmal, son of Clydno, measured the whole of Great Britain '*before the crown of London and supremacy of this Island was seized by the Saxons.*' In it the *pound paying* unit of land was the 'mænol' (see *Ancient Laws, &c.*, p. 90), consisting of 1,024 erws. As the 'mænol' was the pound paying unit, each erw would pay one farthing if the pound consisted of 256 pence, *i.e.* the very number the pound would contain according to Form 12. Taking the divisions of the land as stated in the *Ancient Laws*, the following represents it:

- 1 erw = 1 farthing.
- 4 erws = 1 tydden = 1d.
- 16 erws = 1 rander = 4d.
- 64 erws = 1 gavael = 16d. or one 'ora denariorum.

256 erws = 1 trew = 64*d.* or threescore Norman pence of 32 wheat-grains
or 24 Troy (see Forms 11 and 12).
1,024 erws = 1 mænol = 256*d.* = 1 pound of silver.

The Gavael, therefore, answers to the *ora denariorum*, as at Pampesuuorde and the 30 Manors inter Ripam.

At page 91 of the *Ancient Laws, &c.*, sec. 15, written in the thirteenth century, we read (in language suited to the money of that day), 'Three score pence is charged on each trew of the four that are in a mænol, and so subdivided into quarters in succession until each erw of the tydden be assessed,' therefore there is no erw in the mænol free from taxation, an expression which is only consistent with a pound of 256 pence, equalling as they did 240 pence each, $\frac{1}{16}$ heavier, 60 of the one equalling 64 of the other, as in the inter Ripam Manors (see above); so also in the Laws of William the Conqueror, I. c. ii. forty sol (*i.e.* 40 × 16 or 640 denarii) in Merchenlahe = fifty sol (*i.e.* 50 × 12 or 600 denarii) in West-saxenelahe, as the *foris factum vice comitis*. In the same way the treaty and the money in the treaty between Alfred and Guthrum are to be explained. I have explained it at p. 242 *et seq.* of Vol. I. of *Domesday Studies*, as the explanation is too long to put here, see No. 45*e* and No. 45*f post*.

I will now proceed to apply the above principles to known talents and existing pounds, merely remarking that it is marvellous how well preserved weights have been—no thanks, however, to vegetable grains—so closely have they been preserved that in some cases they are *absolutely* alike; for instance, the Barbary rottol and the Troy pound, the Swedish and the Madras drachms, &c.; and I shall call everything 'exact' which does not vary more than the fraction of a Troy grain in an ounce.

I will take Solon's Attic weight first as a standard to which Xenophon and others refer, and because it happens to be the best known. The weights of existing drachmæ (of

which there are hundreds still in existence) show it to be between 4'3735 grammes, 67'5 Troy, and that at which Hultsch places it, viz. 4'3665 grammes—practically this is the same thing, as a pound founded on the one makes 5,400 Troy grains, and founded on the other 5,390, which is exactly the same within my heretofore expressed meaning of the word 'exact.' Taking 8,000 of these, Solon's drachmæ, to find the *original* talent, it resolves itself into this :

Original Asiatic Talent, 34,987 grammes, or 540,000 Troy grains.
 Talent ÷ 60 minæ of 583'11 grammes, or 9,000 Troy grains.
 Talent ÷ 80 minæ of 437'335 grammes, or 6,750 Troy grains.*
 Talent ÷ 100 minæ of 349'87 grammes, or 5,400 Troy grains.

* This is the libra mercatoria of Fleta.

We have therefore here as a standard, firstly, a drachma of 3'4987 grammes; secondly, a drachma of 5'8311 grammes, when the *original* talent is divided normally (Form 1) into 60 minæ each of 100 drachmæ; and thirdly, a drachma of 4'37335 grammes, when Solon adopted the division of the original talent into 80 minæ each of 100 of such drachmæ. So the talent, reckoned according to Form 1, would be 288,000 chalci, and according to Form 5, would be 384,000 chalci. The Troy grain, of course, is not derived from it, but from a very different talent, hereinafter shown.

The Asiatic Talent of 34,987 grammes (540,000 Troy grains).

The identity of this talent is proved thus: under the head of an Asiatic 'Siclos' Photius describes it as equal to 8 Attic obols—taking 4'37335 grammes as the Attic drachma (see *ante*), or 67'5 Troy; and dividing it by six to get the obol, we have '72888 grammes as the Attic obol; this multiplied by 8 gives 5'83104 as the 'Siclos;' this multiplied by 100 gives the mina (100 drachmæ), or 583'104; and this multiplied by 60 gives the talent of 34986'24 (540,000 Troy); it is also the contents of 8000 Attic drachmæ of 4'37335 grammes or 7500 Eubœan drachmæ of 4'665.

	Error	Place	Weight	Talent of 34,987 grammes
17	Exact	ENGLAND	Pound	<p>Tower (Talent divided by 100): 349·87 grammes (or 5400 Troy), divided into 12 ounces of 3456 chalci or 6912 half chalci, Form 10, the half chalcos or grain would therefore be ·05062 grammes. This is the Tower Pound of 24 solidi of 12 peninga = 288, if the peninga were of 24 half chalci of Form 10. If the pound was divided according to Form 8 into 240 peninga, of course there would be 5760 half chalci of ·0607 grammes, and the pound would divide into 240 denarii of 24 half chalci of Form 8 to the denarius; but I imagine that the Anglo-Saxons, using the duodecimal aggregation into a unit, divided their pound into 288 peninga like the Romans. This pound I have no doubt the Saxons found here when they came; it is, as we have seen, formed on the same talent as Solon's Attic drachmæ which have been dug up in England. See also Shortt's <i>Sylva Antiqua Iscana</i>, p. 81, quoting Mr. C. R. Smith. An engraving of Mr. Roach Smith's (probably a tetradrachm) Greek coin and an account of its finding are to be found in the <i>History and Antiquities of Rochester</i>, 1772, at p. 274.</p>
18	Exact	ENGLAND	Libra	<p>Mercatoria of Fleta, 437·335 grammes, or 8640 half chalci of Form 10 (6750 Troy), <i>i.e.</i> fifteen ounces or solidi of 24 peninga of 24 half chalci. This is the pound of 15 ounces, marked 15, in pre-Norman times; it is Solon's Attic mina, 60 of which made his reduced talent of 26,232 grammes, and eighty the original talent, or 34,987 grammes. The identity of it is confirmed by the following extract to be found at page 33 of the Appendix to the Government Reports on Weights and Measures, 1820, under the word 'Stone' of lead: '15 pounds each, 25 shillings in weight, 31 Ed. I.: that is, each of 6750 grains.' This of course is the Norman arrangement; the</p>

	Error	Place	Weight	Talent of 34,987 grammes
18 A.	Exact	SAYDE (Syria). Kelly, p. 227	Rottolo	Saxon would be 30 shillings of 288 half chalci of Form 10 (see the division of No. 83); Pollux calls it the Italian mina (see also No. 86). The following are all derived from the same talent (see note after No. 80 and No. 83). Of Acre, 2186·082 grammes or 43,200 half chalci (33,740 Troy). This is 5 of Fleta's libræ mercatoriae, see above; within <i>two</i> Troy grains in the pound, <i>i.e.</i> 6748 (Troy, instead of 6750 Troy). There was another rottolo of 60 Troy ounces of 10 drams to ounce.
18 B.	Exact	ARRAGON, 6144. Kelly, p. 23	Pound	Pensil (talent divided by 100): 349·8 grammes of 6144 grains (half chalci, Form 9), (5398 Troy). This is within 2 grains of the Tower pound of 5400 Troy. This is divided into 12 ounces of 192 arienses each, of 32 grains of ·05694 grammes. The mark of 8 ounces is 50 Troy grains light, and is that of Spain.
19	Exact	BRUNSWICK, 8192. Kelly, p. 54	Pound	Commercial (talent divided by 75): 466·891 or 8192 grains or half chalci of ·057 grammes, Form 9 (7206 Troy). This is divided into 1024 hellars or 16 ounces of 32 pfenings of 16 half chalci each.
20	Exact	LEIPSIK, 7680. Kelly, p. 205	Pound	Commercial, 466·8 grammes (talent divided by 75), or 7680 half chalci of ·06079 grammes, Form 8 (7206 Troy). Note that 512 of 15 = 256 of 30; there are 16 ounces of 512 pfenings.
21	Exact	FRANKFORT, 8192. Kelly, p. 148	Pound	Commercial (talent divided by 75): 467·15 grammes or 8192 half chalci, ·0571 grammes, Form 9 (7210 Troy), divided into 1024 hellars and 512 pfenings.
22	1 Troy grain in ounce out	COLOGNE, 8192. Kelly, p. 71	Pound	Commercial (talent divided by 75): 467·538 grammes or 8192 grains or half chalci of ·0571 grammes, Form 9 (7216 Troy). Divided into 16 ounces of 512 pfenings. The mark of 8 ounces is half this. Each of the half chalci is subdivided into 16 parts, and each 16 half chalci equal 17 eschen. So here we have the weight of the half chalcos, and the weight of the vegetable grain as supposed.

	Error	Place	Weight	Talent of 34,987 grammes
23	Ditto	HAMBURG, 8192. Kelly, p. 170	Pound	Gold and silver (talent divided by 75): 467·538 or 8192 half chalci of 0571 grammes, Form 9 as above; but note this is accommodated to the Dutch esch, which is $\frac{1}{16}$ lighter, so that there would be 544 eschen instead of 512 grains to an ounce. $512 + \text{a sixteenth} = 544$: there are therefore 8704 eschen, or 8192 half chalci of Form 9, called at Hamburg Richt pfenings. See Cologne above, and see Zurich <i>post</i> , No. 31.
24	$1\frac{15}{16}$ Troy out	BERLIN, 7680. Kelly, p. 34	Pound	Commercial (talent divided by 75), <i>i.e.</i> 468·50 grammes, or 7680 half chalci of Form 8 (7231 Troy), divided into 512 pfenings or 16 ounces.
25	$1\frac{3}{16}$ Troy grain out in ounce	STETTIN. Kelly, p. 324	Pound	Commercial talent divided by 75): 467·7 grammes of 16 ounces (7219 Troy). Divided as at Cologne.
26	$1\frac{1}{4}$ Troy grain out in ounce	WIRTEM- BERG. Kelly, p. 369	Pound	Commercial (talent divided by 75): 467·8 grammes of 16 ounces (7220 Troy). Divided as at Cologne.
27	2 Troy grains out in ounce	KÖNIGSBERG, 7680. Kelly, p. 198	Pound	Commercial (talent divided by 75): 468·5 grammes, 7680 grains or half chalci, Form 8 (7231 Troy), $\frac{1}{2}$ chalcos = 061 gramme, reckoned as at Berlin by an edict of 1714.
28	$1\frac{1}{2}$ Troy grain out in ounce	AIX LA CHA- PELLE. Kelly, p. 2	Pound	Commercial (talent divided by 75): 468·705 grammes (7234 Troy), 512 pfenings in 16 ounces.
29	Exact	ST. GALL. Kelly, p. 350.	Pound	(Heavy) (talent divided by 60) or the mina of 584·164 grammes (9016 Troy), pound of 20 ounces. This is the original mina of the talent; $34,987 \text{ grammes} \div 60 = 583\cdot1$ grammes.
30	$1\frac{9}{16}$ Troy grain out in ounce	Ditto.	Pound	(Light) (talent divided by 75): 464·822 grammes (7175 Troy) in 16 ounces.
31	Exact	ZURICH, 8192. Kelly, p. 375	Pound	Light (talent divided by 75): 468·6 grammes, 8192 grains or half chalci of Form 9 (7233 Troy). This pound is 16 ounces, but this is accommodated to the Zurich grain, which is $\frac{1}{16}$ lighter, so there are 8704 Zurich grains (see Hamburg, <i>ante</i> , No. 23 of Form 9), and 17 of such grains in 16 of the 8192 and in the 512 pfenings.
32	..	Ditto, 9216	Pound	Heavy. This is 18 ounces instead of 16, and note that in both 16 grains (17) are put into the penny,

	Error	Place	Weight	Talent of 34,987 grammes
33	$1\frac{2}{9}$ Troy grain out in ounce	CANIA. Kelly, p. 62	Rottello	and in the pound there are 9216 of Form 9, 8138 Troy grains.
34	Exact	ULM. Kelly, p. 352	Pound	527·25 grammes, 18 ounces of the Tower pound (8143 Troy). Commercial (talent divided by 75): 468·7 grammes (7234 Troy). This is 16 ounces or two marks.
35	$2\frac{3}{4}$ Troy grains out in ounce	ROTTERDAM. Kelly, p. 297	Pound	Light (talent divided by 75): 469·38 grammes, or 7243 Troy grains, or 7680 half chaldi of Form 8, of ·0611 grammes.
36	$1\frac{7}{12}$ Troy grain out in ounce	GENOA, 6912. Kelly, p. 159	Peso	Grosso (talent divided by 100): 348·6 grammes, 6912 grains or half chaldi, Form 10, of ·05043 grammes (5381 Troy). This is divided into 12 ounces of 24 denarii of 20 grains, like the Anglo-Saxon, or 288 in all. The talent of 34,860 grammes was also divided into 100 Rottoli of 18 ounces, or 150 pounds of 12 ounces. There was a Peso Sotile of 316·963, of which the peso grosso is ten per cent. heavier.
37	$3\frac{3}{4}$ Troy grains out in ounce	MECCA. Kelly, p. 226	Rottolo	Talent (divided by 75): 462·874 grammes in 15 ounces (7144 Troy grains). Note, divided into 15 instead of 16.
38	$2\frac{1}{4}$ Troy grains out in ounce	BETELFAGUI. Kelly, p. 40	Rattlo	Talent (divided by 75): 462·198 in 16 ounces Vakias (7136 Troy), 7680 half chaldi (Form 3), of ·06019 grammes.
39	4 Troy grains out in ounce	STRASBURG. Kelly, p. 327	Livre	470·778 (7266 Troy) or 7680 half chaldi of Form 8, of ·0613 grammes.
40	Exact	OVIEDO. Kelly, p. 226, vol. ii	Talent	Or 6990·996 grammes, or 20 pounds of 349·549. In 12 ounces like the Anglo-Saxons, 5395 Troy grains or 6912 half chaldi of Form 10.
41	5 Troy grains out in ounce	GALICIA. Kelly, p. 150	Pound	Commercial (talent divided by 60): 576·0 grammes of 20 ounces. Sixty of this is the Tower talent, viz., 60×5760 grammes = 34,560 grammes, less 5 Troy grains in ounce. Twelve hundred ounces in talent. See No. 44.
42	5 Troy grains out in ounce	CONSTANCE. Kelly, vol. ii. p. 224	Pound	Commercial (talent divided by 75): 472 grammes (7285 Troy grains).
43	5 Troy grains out in ounce	ERFURT. AUGSBURG. Kelly, p. 25	Mark	Exactly the same. Eight ounces of the talent (or talent divided by 150): 236·036 grammes or 3840 half chaldi of ·0614 grammes, Form 8. Divided into

	Error	Place	Weight	Talent of 34,987 grammes
44	5 Troy grains out in ounce	JAPAN. Kelly, p. 197	The Catty	256 pfenings of 15 half chalci and 8 ounces. There are 3643 Troy grains. Talent (divided by 60): 589·607 grammes of 20 ounces of 29·48 grammes to ounce. 9100 Troy grains or 455 to ounce. See No. 41.
45	2½ Troy grains out in ounce	ALEXANDRIA Kelly, p. 4, and vol. ii. p. 224	Rottolo	Zauro, double (talent divided by 75): 938·5121 grammes, 2 pounds each of 16 ounces of 469·256 grammes. Total, 14,485. Troy grains, 15,360 chalci, Form 8, of ·0611 grammes.

It is to be observed that (in all the above cases, when the original talent of 34,987 grammes is divided by 75) the same result would be attained by dividing the original Troy talent of 37,320 grammes by 80; both divisions produce 100 of the drachma of 4·665, which is the Eubœan drachma, so it is quite possible that both weights were in England side by side. The talent of 34,987, divided by 80, produces 100 of Solon's Attic drachma of 43,665, or 4·373, as already stated, and the talent of 32,744 (see *post*), divided by 75, would produce the same result.

The Æginetan, Syro-Phœnician, Assyrian, and Chinese Talent of 37,320 grammes, or 576,000 Troy grains, or 10,000 drachmæ of 3·7320.

This talent is well identified by existing drachmæ of Ægina of 6·22 grammes and 96 Troy grains, *i.e.* 60×622 grammes (the mina)=37,320 the talent (see Hussey, *Weights and Measures*, p. 59), and also by the prevalence in old times on the sea-coast of Asia Minor and the Islands of the little gold piece of 40 Troy grains (Hussey, p. 72), or 2·59168 grammes, 144 of which make exactly 373·2 grammes, and 100 of these latter the talent. See also *Archæological Review*, vol. iv. p. 55, description of 433 small gold ringlets, each weighing 16 Troy

grains, which would be the exact weight of an Æginetan obol, the whole dug up at Petroasa in Wallachia, together with a tube or bracelet weighing 96 Troy grains, *i.e.* the Æginetan drachma. Moreover, there are in the British Museum some large stone ducks dug up at Babylon, weighing 480 *Troy* ounces, and therefore they would be 40 *Troy* pounds, or 14,928 grammes, *i.e.* $4 \times 373\cdot2$ (*Troy* pound). On the back of some of these ducks there are certain inscriptions stating them to be thirty mana or half $\frac{60}{2}$ a Babylonian talent (see *Discoveries in the Ruins of Nineveh and Babylon*, by Layard, 1853, p. 600); each one of these, therefore, would be, if Mr. Layard's weighing is correct, 30 of 16 ounces (that is, 497·6 grammes, $16 \times 31\cdot1$ grammes or *Troy* ounce), and therefore 75 of these minæ, according to Form 4, make the talent of 37,320 grammes, the hundredth part of which is the *Troy* pound and the 75th part the Babylonish maneh of 497·6 grammes, and it is also the amount of 80 Eubœan drachmæ of 4·665 grammes. Moreover, there are two stone weights dug up at Herculaneum, numbered 190 and 191 by Bayardi (see Boeckh, p. 183), and they each weigh 3731 grammes, that is, 10 *Troy* pounds each, or 800 Eubœan drachmæ of 4·665. The Eubœan drachma of 4·665 grammes is 72 *Troy* grains, and the didrachma of 144 grains is the Egyptian kat, several specimens of which have been dug up by Mr. Flinders Petrie.

	Error	Place	Weight	Talent of 37,320 grammes
45 (a)	Exact	ENGLAND, 5760	<i>Troy</i>	Pound (talent divided by 100): 373·2 grammes or 5760 half chalci, Form 8, <i>i.e.</i> 5760 <i>Troy</i> . Divided into 12 ounces or 240 pennies of 24.
45 (b)	Exact	ANGLO- SAXON, 5760	<i>Troy</i>	373·2 grammes or 5760 half chalci of Form 10. Divided into 12 ounces or 288 pennies of 20 half chalci.
45 (c)	Exact	APOTHE- CARIES 5760	<i>Troy</i>	373·2 grammes of 5760 half chalci of Form 8. Divided into 12 ounces of 288 scruples of 20 half

	Error	Place	Weight	Talent of 37,320 grammes
45 (d)	Exact	BABYLON, Ancient	Mina	chalci. Five of these half chalci equal 8 of Form 14. 497·6 grammes or 7680 half chalci of Form 8, divided into 16 ounces. This is one of the 30 mana described above. See also No. 50.
45 (e)	Exact	'INTER RIPAM'	Pound	Talent (divided by 100): 373·2 grammes or 7680 half chalci of Form 12 (5760 Troy), <i>i.e.</i> 12 ounces of 240 pence of 32 of such half chalci (see explanation of 'inter ripam' <i>ante</i> , and also notes to Forms 11 and 12 <i>ante</i>).
45 (f)	Exact	'INTER RIPAM'	Pound	373·2 grammes or 7680 half chalci of Form 12 (5760 Troy), 16 solidi of 16 pence (256) of 30 of such half chalci (see <i>ante</i> , explanation of 'inter ripam').
46	Exact	BASSORA (Arabia), 72. Kelly, p. 30	Miscal	Talent (divided by 8000): 4·665 grammes 72 grains (72 Troy). This is the Eubœan drachma, and 80 of them make the Troy pound, and the miscal is the exact weight of the old Eubœan drachma of 4·665 grammes. But 100 of these drachmæ go to the pound or checki, making exactly 466·5 grammes, or 7200 Troy grains or chalci, <i>i.e.</i> 15 ounces of 31·1, and the arrangement would be according to Form 8. The half chalcos is ·064792 gramme or a Troy grain (see No. 18 and paragraph after No. 45).
47	Exact	ABYSSINIA, 4800. Kelly, p. 2	Rottolo	Talent (divided by 120): 311 grammes 4800 Troy grains or half chalci, is therefore exactly 10 Troy ounces or ten-twelfths of the Troy pound; in other words, the talent would be divided by 120 instead of 100, thus producing 120 rottoli instead of 100 pounds—so, instead of 5760 half chalci to the pound, there would be only 4800, according to Form 15. The half chalcos is ·064792 gramme or Troy grains.
48	Exact	SAYDE, 28,758. Kelly, p. 227	Rottolo	Of 60 ounces of 10 drachms to ounce of 31·037, 1862·251 grammes or 28,758 half chalci or Troy grains, giving 479·3 Troy grains to the ounce, which is according to Form 15. Talent divided by 120.

390 SUMMARY OF A 'NEW VIEW OF THE GELDABLE

	Error	Place	Weight	Talent of 37,320 grammes
49	Exact	NICE. Kelly, p. 269	Pound	Commercial (talent divided by 120): 311·6 grammes, 4800 grains or half chalci of Form 15 (4809 Troy), 10 ounces as above, but divided however into ten ounces.
50	Exact	TRIPOLI (Barbary), 7680. Kelly, p. 379	Rottolo	(Talent divided by 75): 497·6 grammes, 7680 grains or half chalci, Form 8 (7680 Troy), 16 ounces of 10 drams to ounce, 16 kharouba to dram—there would then be 3 half chalci or Troy grains to the kharouba.
51	Exact	TRIESTE and VIENNA, 8192. Kelly, p. 336	Pound	Commercial 559·6. This is 1½ pound Troy, divided however into 16 ounces instead of 18; there are 512 pfenings in it, so the half chalci would be 8192, Form 9, instead of 8640 half chalci, Form 8, and there would be 16 half chalci in the pfening, or ·06831 grammes each. Each half chalcos is divided into 16 parts, making 131,072 right pfenings in all.
52	Exact	VERONA. Kelly, p. 348	Peso	Grosso (talent divided by 75): 497·343 grammes (7676 Troy), or half chalci 7680, Form 8. This is 16 ounces of Troy pound.
53	3 grains	CHINA, 1000. Kelly, p. 67	Catty	Of 16 tales of 37·566 or 576 grains or half chalci, so there are in the tale 576 grains instead of 480, i.e. 12 × 48, instead of 10 × 48, which is our Troy ounce, but the tale is divided decimally into 1000 cash. The tale is therefore the tenth part of the Æginetan or Troy pound, and as there are 1000 cash in it, there must be 1,000,000 cash in the Æginetan talent; it is evidently therefore divided in Egyptian manner (see Form 16).
54	Exact	EMBDEN. Kelly, p. 126	Pound	Commercial (talent divided by 75): 496·8 grammes, 8192 grains or half chalci, Form 9 (7668 Troy), 16 ounces.
55	Exact	MUNICH. Kelly, p. 261	Pound	Commercial, 560·839 grammes, 8640 half chalci grains, Form 8 (8656 Troy). This is 18 ounces of Form 8.
56	Exact	FIUME. Kelly, p. 32	Funti	Weight, 558·7 grammes, 9216 half chalci or grains of Form 9 (8623 Troy), being a pound and a half divided into 16 ounces of 576 half chalci to the ounce.

	Error	Place	Weight	Talent of 37,320 grammes
57	2 Troy grains out in ounce	BERGEN. Kelly, p. 32	Pound	Talent (divided by 75): 499·61 grammes or 8192 half chalci grains, Form 9 (7716 Troy), 16 ounces.
58	2 Troy grains out in ounce	MOCHA, 480. Kelly, p. 257	Vakia	One ounce, 30·970 grammes, 480 grains or half chalci of Form 16, but four into ten, <i>i.e.</i> 40 of these ounces or vakia make a maund of 1238·8 grammes: half of this is 619·4 grammes, which is the Æginetan or Troy mina of 622 grammes. The talent is divided in the Egyptian way (see <i>ante</i>).
59	2½ Troy grains out in ounce	COPEN- HAGEN. Kelly, p. 76	Pound	Commercial (talent divided by 75): 500·71 grammes, 8192 grains or half chalci of Form 9 (7720 Troy), 16 ounces or 512 of 16 or 256 of 32 (see China, No. 53).
	Ditto	BOLSANO. Kelly, p. 45.	Pound	Commercial, 500·6 grammes, same positive weight.
60	6 Troy grains out in ounce	ALEPPO	Metical	Or drachma, 4·729 (the Euboean is 4·665) grammes 72 grains (73 Troy).
61	...	ALGIERS	Metical	80 of these make the pound of 5760, Form 8.
62	Exact	LUCCA, 6912. Kelly, vol. ii. 226	Peso	Grosso (talent divided by 100): 373·48, 3456 chalci (5763 Troy). Divided into 12 ounces of 288 denari and 6912 grani or half chalci, Form 10, <i>i.e.</i> 24 grains or 12 chalci to each denarius, divided like the Anglo-Saxon division. The half chalci would be ·054 gramme.
63	Exact	BREMEN. Kelly, p. 49	Pound	Commercial (talent divided by 75): 498·25 grammes (7690 Troy), 7680 half chalci of Form 8. Divided into 16 ounces and 512 'orts,' giving 15 half chalci to 'ort.'

The Ethiopian and Egyptian Talent of 34,016 grammes, or 52,500 Troy grains.

The identity of this is fully proved in two ways. First, from the Farnesian Congius, or the brass vessel formerly in the collection of Alexander Farnese, and which bears the old Roman inscription—

IMP. CÆSARE
 VESPES VI
 T. CAES. AUG. F IIII^{cos}
 MENSURÆ
 EXACTÆ IN
 CAPITOLIO
 P. X

The weight of distilled water which this holds is exactly 3401 grammes. Secondly, from the inscription in the 'Stele' of Barkal in the Museum of Bulaq, where it appears that there was in Ethiopia a provincial weight-system of which there was a unit, a very small weight named a Pek, weighing '71 or '709 grammes. Now taking this unit to be or to indicate 10 chalci of '0709 grammes, and reckoning 480,000 to the *talent* in the usual way, we get the talent as before, 34,032 grammes. This weight is of peculiar interest to us in England; the Romans might have got it from Egypt, unless it existed in Italy before their advent to power, which is possible and probable, as it still exists there, as well as the Roman pound of 327·44 grammes.

	Error	Place	Weight	Talent = 34,016 grammes
64	Exact The ounce is 28·3463 grammes	ENGLAND, 7680. Jeakes	Pound	Avoirdupois (talent divided by 75): 453·544 grammes or 7680 chalci of Form 8 (7000 Troy), 480 in the ounce—16 ounces. I have taken this division from 'Jeakes' Arithmetic, Surveyed and Re- viewed,' London (1596), thus: 'The <i>avoirdupois</i> pound was parted in 16 ounces, every ounce into 8 drachms, and every dram into 3 scruples, and every scruple into 20 grains.' One of the pounds dug up at Herculaneum, described by Bayardi, weighed exactly 452 grammes.
65	Exact	ENGLAND. Kelly, p. 220	Provin- cial	Pound, 510 grammes (18 ounces), or 8640 chalci, Form 8. This is to be found in the counties of

	Error	Place	Weight ¹	Talent = 34,016 grammes.
66	Exact	ENGLAND. Kelly, p. 220	Hundred	Cheshire, Cornwall, Devonshire, Dorsetshire, Gloucestershire, Herefordshire, Lancashire, Lincolnshire, Staffordshire, North and South Wales, and Westmoreland—see Government Report; but at Nuremberg, No. 73, the same weight is divided into 16 ounces. Weight that is 100 of the provincial pound. Of course a <i>hundred weight</i> could never be 112 pounds, but it must mean one hundred of some well-defined weight, and 51,000 grammes is almost 112 avoirdupois pounds. Moreover, a stone duck of exactly 30 'manehs' each of this amount of 510 grammes was dug up by Mr. Layard in the ruins of Nineveh (see Norris, vol. xvi. <i>Asiatic Journal</i> , p. 215).
67	Exact	FLORENCE, 6912. Kelly, p. 130	Libra	Talent (divided by 100): 339·5 grammes, 6912 grains (half chalci), Form 10 (or 5240 Troy), 12 ounces of 288 denari of 24 half chalci.
68	...	LEGHORN, 6912	...	Do.
68	Exact	MADRAS. Kelly, vol. ii. p. 223	Star	Pagoda weight, 3·401 grammes, 52·5 Troy. This is the drachma of the talent divided by 10,000, and of a pound divided by 100, and equals the Roman pound of 327·48 divided by 96 almost—8 of them going to the ounce; but 34,010 grammes existed as a separate talent in Asia and Egypt, and in Egypt would be divided as in Form 16.
69	6 Troy grains out in ounce	PORTUGAL, 4608. Kelly, p. 211	Marco	Of 8 ounces, 229·46 grammes, as divided at Florence into 192 escrupulos or 4608 graos or half chalci, Form 10 (3541 Troy), 192 + 96 = 288: 8 + 4 ounces = 12. See No. 71. Half chalcos = ·0498.
70	1½ Troy grains out in ounce	ROME, 6912. Kelly, p. 293.	Libra	Talent (divided by 100): 339·121 grammes, 6912 grains or half chalci, Form 10 (5234 Troy), 12 ounces of 24 denari of 24 half chalci of ·04906.
71	6¼ Troy grains out in ounce	SPAIN, 4608. Kelly, p. 320	Marc	Of <i>eight</i> ounces, 230·043 grammes, 4608 grains or half chalci, Form 10 (3550 Troy), divided into 64 orchatos and 384 tomynes of 12 grains. Gold is weighed by 10 ounces (not 12) of Form 8 = 4800

	Error	Place	Weight	Talent = 34,016 grammes
72	5 Troy grains out in ounce	GENEVA, 8640. Kelly, p. 153	Poids	half chalci (<i>see</i> No. 69). Half chalcus = '04992. Foible (talent divided by 75): 458·831 grammes, 8640 grains or half chalci, Form 8 (7081 Troy), divided into 15 ounces of 24 deniers or 576 grains = 18 ounces of 20 deniers or 480 grains. There is another weight of 18 ounces of 24 deniers to ounce.
72	2½ Troy grains out in ounce	LUCCA, 6912. Kelly, p. 224	Peso	Sottile (talent divided by 100): 337·77 grammes, 6912 grains or half chalci of Form 10, 12 ounces of 576 to ounce (5213 Troy).
73	Exact	NUREMBERG, Kelly, p. 271	Pound	Of two marks, 509·9 grammes, 12,288 half chalci or 6144 chalci or grains, Form 14 (7870 Troy), 18 ounces, or a pound and a half divided into sixteen ounces of 512 pfenings of 24 half chalci. This weight of 510 grammes has been dug up at Babylon (<i>see</i> Layard's <i>Nineveh and its Remains</i>), and is the pound one hundred of which is our hundredweight, approximately. <i>See</i> No. 65.
74	Exact	PADUA, 6912. Kelly, p. 275	Libra	Sottile (talent divided by 100): 340·158 grammes or 6912 grains or half chalci, Form 10 (5250 Troy). <i>See</i> Venice. Kelly, p. 346.
75	Exact	RATISBON, Kelly, p. 286	Pound	Commercial (talent divided by 60): 568·6 grammes, 10,240 grains or half chalci, Forms 2 and 9 (8777 Troy). This is the mina of the talent, and sixty of it give 34,116 grammes as the talent. Twenty ounces divided into 16 ounces or 512 pfenings of 20.
76	Exact	ROSTOCK. Kelly, p. 296	Pound	Town standard for commercial dealings with Russia, 508·7 grammes, 8640 grains or half chalci, Form 8 (7852 Troy), 18 ounces avoirdupois. The Babylon weight. <i>See</i> England, <i>ante</i> .
77	Exact	SWEDEN. Kelly, p. 329	Victualie	Weight 425·2. Eighty of this make the talent of 34,016, and there was a weight dug up at Herculaneum (<i>see</i> Boeckh, p. 182) weighing nearly 42,700, which evidently represents one hundred of these victualie weights.
78	Exact	SWEDEN. Kelly, p. 329	Pound	Metal or exportation, weight 340·1. One hundred of this make the talent, or 34,010 grammes.

	Error	Place	Weight	Talent = 34,016 grammes
79	Exact.	MADRAS. Kelly, vol. ii. p. 223.	Star.	Pagoda weight 3'401 grammes. Ten thousand of this is the talent.
80	Exact.	ALEXANDRIA Kelly, p. 4, & vol. ii. p. 224.	Rottoli.	Forfori (talent divided by 80), <i>i.e.</i> 423'869 grammes or 6542 Troy.

NOTE.—The drachma of the talent of 34,010 grammes (*i.e.* ten thousand of 3'4016) is not to be confused with the drachma of 3.41, which arises on the division of the Roman pound of 327'44 when divided by 96. This last is spoken of in Cleopatra's tables (C.X.) as one of the 128 drachmæ, in the following passage: 'The mina has 16 ounces, 128 drachmæ, 384 grammata, 768 oboli, 1152 thermoi, 2304 ceratia, 6144 chalci.' 128 drachmæ of 3'41 grammes give 436'6 grammes, which is the Attic mina, or Roman pound of 327'44 + $\frac{1}{4}$, or 16 ounces. The computation of the chalci in this passage completely coincides with Form 14. The mina of 436'6 is Fleta's libra mercatoria (see No. 18).

The Asiatic (Persian?) Talent of 32,744 grammes, or 505,371 Troy grains. The hundredth part of this is 327'44 grammes, or 5,053 Troy, and this is the Roman pound.

This talent and pound, which still exists in Italy, is not to be confused with another pound of 340'1, also existing in Italy—they have often been so confused. The talent of 32,744 grammes, its Asiatic origin, and its hundredth part of Roman pound, are identified in various ways. Xenophon, in his *Anabasis*, I, 5, 6, gives the 'siglus' as seven and a half Attic obols. The Attic obol (see *ante*) was '72775 grammes (taking 4'3665 grammes, Hultsch's estimate of the Attic drachma and the sixth of it, the obol, in the usual way), and seven and a half of the obol would give 5'45812 grammes as the corresponding Asiatic drachma of the minah, *i.e.* the siglos, and 6000 of these (see Form *ante*) gives 32,744 as the talent and 327'44 as the pound. This weight is confirmed again thus: Pliny (xxxiii. 46) states the 'aurei' to be at the rate of 40 to the pound; now several of these aurei are still in existence—there is one in the Bodleian, of the time of Julius Cæsar,

weighing 126·5 Troy grains, *i.e.* a shekel as found by Mr. Flinders Petrie, and one of Antony of 126 grains, and Raper speaks of many more. Taking the mean of these 126·25 grains and multiplying that by 40 gives 5050 as the Roman pound. This weight is also confirmed by the weight of the scripular aurei, the weight of which (as the result of accurately weighing them) M. Letronne (*Sur l'Evaluation des Monnaies grecques et romaines*) puts at 21·368 French grains, or 17·52 Troy grains; this multiplied by 288, the number of scripula in the pound, gives 5045 Troy grains in the pound. It is well known that the Romans divided their pound into denarii, or drachmæ, at different times, in different ways: thus, before Hannibal's time, by 72; after then to Nero's time by 84, then by 96, and afterwards by 72 again, thus:

	Error	Place	Weight	Talent = 32,744 grammes
81	Exact.	ROME, Old.	Pound.	(Talent divided by 100): 327·44 grammes of 1728 siliquæ or double chalci, or 6912 half chalci, Form 10 (5053 Troy grains). This is the pound divided by 72 with 6 drachmæ of 4·547 grammes to the ounce—the talent consisting of 1200 ounces. Nos. 84, 86, 88, 90, 92, are existing examples of this division of the pound, &c., in Italy.
82	Exact.	ROMAN, Old.	...	(Talent divided by 100): 327·44 grammes, divided by 96 in 96 drachmæ, or 12 ounces of 8 drachmæ of 3·41 to the drachma. A passage of Pollux states this to be 8 drachmæ to the ounce. As every drachma is supposed to contain 48 chalci, there would be $(12 \times 8) \ 96 \times 48 = 4608$ chalci. This is fully confirmed by the same passage, which tells us that 18 ceratia go to the drachma, and $2\frac{2}{3}$ chalci to the ceration, and $96 \times 18 \times 2\frac{2}{3}$ do. make 4608 chalci, which is well represented thus, $\frac{4608}{1728}$, Forms 8, 10, and 14, and so fully confirms my statement as to the origin of grains.
83	Exact.	ROMAN, Old.	...	327·44 grammes divided by 84 into 84 denarii of 3·898 grammes.

	Error	Place	Weight	Talent of 32,744 grammes
84	...	ITALIAN.	Mina.	<p>This is clearly shown in the description given by Pollux of the Italian mina, or Fleta's libra mercatoria of 15 ounces (talent divided by 75, <i>i.e.</i> 436.6 grammes), which he, Pollux, states to be 112 drachmæ (112×3.898 grammes, <i>i.e.</i> 327.44 + $\frac{1}{3}$ or 109.146, <i>i.e.</i> 436.586 grammes). This is the Attic mina, <i>i.e.</i> a pound and a third or 16 ounces ($84 + 28 = 12 + 4$ ounces), or 4032 chalci + 1344 = 5376 chalci. He states the ounce to be 7 drachmæ. Taking the drachma to contain 48 chalci, as it always did, the number of the chalci in the mina would be (84×48) 4032 chalci, and in the 4 ounces 1344, Form 13. If the mina was divided according to Form 10, it would contain 3456 + 1152 chalci, or 4608 of that Form 10, or 384 denarii of 12 chalci of that form, instead of 288 of 14 of Form 13, as suggested in the forms. It will be seen how well this division of the pound corresponds as suggested at page 263 of my <i>Domesday</i> paper with the rod of 14 feet. See next case. See No. 86. See note after No. 80 and Nos. 18, 85.</p> <p>491.16 grammes being a pound and a half of 5184 chalci or 2592 siliquæ, thus described in Discorides, Kuhn's <i>Collections</i>, xiii. 775: 'The mina, according to the Italian authority, is 18 ounces, <i>i.e.</i> a pound and a half, 144 drachmæ; but the Alexandrian mina is 20 ounces, that is 160 drachmæ,' which is the mina I have described immediately after this, viz. No. 85; so of course the drachma is the same as in No. 82, viz. 3.41 grammes.</p>
85	Exact.	M. E. Old.	Mina.	<p>545.73. This is the Roman mina, being the sixtieth part of 32,744 grammes (talent) in the usual way, or 8422 Troy, that is 20 ounces, which is described as in Pollux, Kuhn's <i>Collections</i>, xiii. 751. The half of it still exists in the mark of Barcelona of 272.654 grammes, No. 88.</p>

	Error	Place	Weight	Talent of 32,744 grammes
86	Exact.	ATTICA, ITALIA, ENGLAND, EGYPT.	Mina.	Talent (divided by 75): 436·6 grammes or 9216 half chalci of Form 10. This is Fleta's libra mercatoria, and is the same as the mina of 16 ounces = talent of 32,744 grammes divided by 75 as alluded to in No. 83, but it is also the talent of 34,928 divided by 80. In No. 83 it is shown by Pollux in the way it was divided by the Romans between Hannibal's time and Nero's. In the present shape I show it as I presume the Anglo-Saxons divided it, and the 6750 Troy grains (see No. 18) represents it as the Normans divided it, taking it at 15 ounces instead of 16; but all these are alike in positive weights. See Forms 4 and 5 and note thereon, and Nos. 11 and 12.
87	...	ROMAN, Old, and ALEX- ANDRIAN.	Mina.	545·7 grammes or talent of 32,744 divided by 60, which is, as Pollux says, 20 ounces (see No. 85). Taking 3456 chalci or 1728 siliquæ or ceratia to the pound, Form 10, this will give 144 siliquæ to the ounce, and as 20 ounces make the mina, then 2880 to the mina gives 8 drachmæ to the ounce; there would be therefore 160 drachmæ in the mina, and dividing the 2880 siliquæ by 160, it gives 18 siliquæ or ceratia to the drachma, <i>i.e.</i> just what Pollux makes it when he says, 'But the weight or drachma holds 18 ceratia, and others say three grammata.' 6 siliquæ therefore went to 1 gramma. Of course this is the division of the pound into 96 drachmæ, each of 3·416 grammes, and 20 ounces would be 96 + 64, <i>i.e.</i> 12 ounces + 8 ounces.
88	Exact.	BARCELONA, 6912. Kelly, p. 27.	Marc.	272·65 grammes, 6912 half chalci of Form 10 (4207 Troy), 10 Roman ounces divided into 8 ounces of 192 adarmes of 18 chalci, or 36 half grains each.
89	Exact.	FRANCE, 9216. Kelly, p. 133.	Poids.	de Marc, 489·5, one and a half Roman pounds, but divided sexdecimally into 16 ounces, 9216 grains or half chalci, Form 9 (7565 Troy grains). The mark consisted

	Error	Place	Weight	Talent of 32,744 grammes
				of 128 gros of 72 half chalci, and it was sometimes divided into 3 deniers of 24 half chalci. Half chalcus = '05311 grammes.
90	Exact.	BASLE, 9216.	Poids.	Do.
91	Exact.	Kelly, p. 28. BERGAMO. Kelly, p. 31.	Peso.	Sottile, 326·227 grammes. (Talent divided by 100.) Old Roman in 12 ounces. There is another pound of 30 of the same ounces, <i>i.e.</i> 3 pounds of Barcelona, No. 81.
92	Exact.	BILBOA. Kelly, p. 41.	Pound.	'Light' 489·5, the French poids de marc (see <i>ante</i>), No. 82, <i>i.e.</i> a pound and a half old Roman.
93	4 Troy grains out in ounce.	BOLSANO.	Pound.	'Light' (talent divided by 100): 330·633 (5103 Troy). The old Roman is 327·44.
94	Exact.	CORSICA. Kelly, p. 80.	Pound.	Commercial old Roman pound and a half, 490·19 grammes, 9216 grains or half chalci, Form 9 (7565 Troy), in 16 ounces.
95	Exact.	CREMONA. Kelly, p. 81.	Pound.	327·6 or talent divided by 100. The old Roman pound.
96	2½ Troy grains out in ounce.	LUNEBERG. Kelly, p. 245.	Pound.	A pound and a half Roman, 488·59 grammes, 8192 grains or half chalci, Form 9 (7540 Troy), divided into 16 ounces or 512 pfenings of 16 or 256 of 32 (see Hamburg, No. 23).
97	Exact.	MILAN, 6912. Kelly, p. 255.	Libra.	Sottile (talent divided by 100): 326·8 old Roman pound of Form 10, 1728 double chalci or 6912 grains or half chalci (5044 Troy), divided into 12 ounces or 288 denarii of 24 half chalci.
98	...	NEUFCHATEL Kelly, p. 269.	Poids.	Marc of 7555 Troy grains (see France, No. 82).
99	Exact.	REGGIO. Kelly, vol. ii. p. 227.	Libra.	Talent (divided by 100): 329·921 Roman pound of 6912 (half chalci) grains (5092 Troy). See Milan, No. 90.
100	4 Troy grains out in ounce.	ZELL. Kelly, p. 373.	Pound.	486·6 grammes, 9216 half chalci or grains, Form 9 (7511 Troy), one and a half of the Roman pound.
101	Exact.	RUSSIA. Kelly, p. 301.	Pound.	(Talent divided by 80): 409·3 grammes or 9216 half chalci, Form 14, divided into 96 solot-nicks. 80 of these pounds of 327·44 (6318 Troy) make the talent.
102	1 grain out in	MARSEILLES, 9216.	Poids.	The table (talent divided by 80): 407·95 grammes or 9216 half

	Error	Place	Weight	Talent of 32,744 grammes
	ounce.	Kelly, p. 252.		chalci, Form 10 (6296 Troy), divided into 16 ounces of 128 gros.
103	$1\frac{1}{4}$ grains out.	SCOTLAND. Kelly, p. 309.	Pound.	Commercial, one and a half Roman pounds, 492.419 grammes, 7680 half chalci, Form 8 (7600 Troy), 16 ounces of 16 drops = 256 of 30 grains.
104	Exact.	AMSTERDAM, 5120. Kelly, p. 9.	Mark.	or 9 ounces (Dutch Troy) of old Roman, 246.084, 5120 half chalci of Form 12, divided into 8 ounces, and the ounce into 20 engels or esterlins, and the engel into 32 azen or aas. It will be seen that the Scotch is virtually double this.
105	Exact.	OLD HEBREW.	Talent.	40,930 grammes. This is 100 of the Russian pound, <i>ante</i> (No. 101). In the Latin version of Epiphanius it is thus spoken of: 'Talentum super omnia pondera quibus alia appenduntur excellit. Exsistit vero cxxv librarum; hoc autem ab Assiriis cepit: dicunt enim quod Abraham in terram Chanaan hanc advexerat formam; talenti autem centesima vicentima quinta pars cxxv una libra est.' If 40,930 grammes is divided by 125, it produces the Roman pound of 327.44 grammes. It is to be found in Petavius 183, and in Cleopatra's tables it is stated thus: 'The talent holds 125 pounds of nomismata 9000.' Now if the pound is divided as it was divided in the earliest times, and again at Constantine's time, into 72 nomismata, drachmæ, or denarii, then 125×72 will give the 9000 nomismata. In another place in Cleopatra's tables this mina is said to have 15 ounces and 90 drachmæ; now 15×27.28 (Roman ounce) does make the mina of 409.3, and this, if divided by 90, gives the drachma of 4.54 grammes, which is, of course, the drachma of the Roman pound ÷ 72, for 15 ounces is to 12 ounces as 90 is to 72. Again, if the pound was divided into 96 nomismata, there would be 12,000 of such nomismata of 3.41 grammes. Now the Hebrew shekel or weight

	Error	Place	Weight	Talent of 32,744 grammes
				was 4 drachmæ, or half the ounce when it contained 8 drachmæ or 96 to the pound instead of 72, there would be 24 shekels in the Roman pound and 3000 in 125 pounds, which perfectly coincides with Genesis xxiv. 22. That passage states the kikkar or talent to be 3000 shekels; this was the 'profane' talent, but the 'talent of the sanctuary' was just double—see Ezekiel xlv. 2, where it is said to consist of 6000 shekels, <i>i.e.</i> 81,860 grammes. Taking the calculations according to Form 16, the maneh would be 60 and the talent 6000 shekels.

The Common Syrian Talent of 32,109 grammes.

The identity of this is proved by certain weights recently found in Syria, and inscribed as 'Demosion Hemimnaion.' They are of brass, and the half-part weighs 535·15 grammes; see Longperrier in *Annals Instit. Arch.*, vol. xix. (1847), p. 340. Multiplying this mina to find the talent $60 \times 535\cdot15$, it gives 32,109 as the talent.

	Error	Place	Weight	Talent of 32,109 grammes
106	Exact.	CONSTANTINOPLE, 6400. Kelly, p. 377.	Checquee	or Pound. (Talent divided by 100): 320·75 grammes or 100 drams of 3·2075, 6400 chalci or 1600 kharouba of 4 chalci of Form 16 (4950 Troy), divided into 10 ounces.
107	Exact.	SMYRNA, 6400. Kelly, p. 315.	Checquee	The same. 321·2 grammes.
108	Exact.	NAPLES, 7200. Kelly, p. 264.	Libra.	(Talent divided by 100): 320·75 grammes, 7200 acini or half chalci (4950 Troy), divided into 12 ounces or 360 trapezi, 7200 acini, Form 16. This is evidently the Western division of the same Egyptian weight that we have above at Constantinople.

	Error	Place	Weight	Talent of 32,109 grammes
109	Exact.	MAJORCA. Kelly, p. 247.	Rottolo.	Commercial (talent divided by 80) : 400·026 grammes or 9000 half chalci, Form 16. This is 15 Neapolitan ounces, <i>i.e.</i> the eightieth part of the talent of 32,075 grammes (or 495,000 Troy), divided into 12 ounces of 750 Neapolitan acini to the ounce (instead of 600) = 9000 of Form 10, as at Barcelona, below.
110	$1\frac{7}{12}$ Troy grain out in ounce.	PATRAS. Kelly, p. 276.	Pound.	Talent (divided by 80), that is 399·637. Practically the same as Majorca, and divided into 12 ounces of half chalci of Form 16 = 6168 Troy.
111	1 Troy grain out in ounce.	BARCELONA, 6912. Kelly, p. 27.	Pound.	Commercial (talent divided by 80) : same as Majorca, 400·63 of 9000 grains or half chalci, Form 16 (6174 Troy), divided into 12 ounces or 6912 half chalci, Form 10.
112	$1\frac{7}{19}$ Troy grain out in ounce.	MODENA. Kelly, p. 258.	Pound.	Commercial (talent divided by 100) : 319·5 grammes of 7200 grains or half chalci, Form 16 (4931 Troy), divided into twelve ounces.
113	Exact.	GALICIA, Spain. Kelly, p. 150.	Pound.	Commercial, 576·122 grammes or 1800 drams of 3·2005 or 115,200 half chalci, Form 16 (8892 Troy), divided into 20 ounces.
114	Exact.	PERSIA. Kelly, p. 277.	Batman.	of cherray is 5751·22, being 1800 drams of 3·195. This is divided into 6 rottols of 300 drams, so it would consist of 115,200 half chalci of Form 16 (or 88,771 Troy).
115	$1\frac{1}{4}$ Troy grain out in ounce.	PRAGUE. Kelly, p. 281.	Pound.	Commercial, 514·4 grammes, 160 of the dram of 3·20 grammes, divided into 16 ounces or 7680 half chalci of Form 8 (or 7940 Troy).

In order to make the application of the tables and remarks therein more easy to understand, it is necessary to observe that though a drachma always consisted of 48 chalci, and was usually divided by the Greeks into 6 oboli, each of 8 chalci, yet sometimes a drachma was, according to Diodorus, Photius, and others, divided into 8 oboli of 6 chalci, so that a weight of 80 Attic drachmæ or 3840 chalci, or 7680 half chalci, Form 12, might be divided into 480 oboli of 8 chalci each,

or into 640 oboli of 6 chalci each (that is, 960 hemioboli of 4 chalci each, or 1280 hemioboli of 3 chalci each); and the same weight would thus contain 240 units of 4 hemioboli of 4 chalci each, or 256 units of 5 hemioboli of 3 chalci each, or 256 of 30 half chalci, *i.e.* the divisions of the 3840 and the 7680 would be made just as they are made at Leipsic, Berlin, Königsberg, Nos. 20, 24, 26, &c. These units are called denarii in the entries in Domesday Book 'inter Ripam.' A drachma also contains 3 scruples. The Tower pound is 80 Attic drachmæ (see *post*), and the Troy pound is 80 drachmæ, each a fifteenth heavier than the Attic drachma. Such a weight can be divided into 8 solidi of 10 drachmæ, or into 10 solidi of 8 drachmæ, or into 12 solidi of 8 smaller drachmæ, *i.e.* into 8 solidi of 120 hemioboli (mancus) with 8 chalci to the obolus = 8 solidi of 160 hemioboli of 6 chalci to the obolus, or into 10 ounces of 24 scruples, or into 12 ounces of 24 smaller scruples. If we allow 2 small solidi to each large solidus and to each ounce, we shall have in the 80 drachmæ 16 solidi of 60 hemioboli (15 dioboli), or 80 hemioboli (16 × 5 hemioboli of *three* chalci), 20 solidi of 12 scruples, or 24 solidi of 12 scruples of smaller grains: read denarii for scruples and dioboli, and there is the solution of the entries in Domesday 'inter Ripam' and the puzzle contained in Guthrum's Treaty. If the Troy pound was used in that Treaty and the 80 Attic drachmæ consequently raised by one fifteenth, this addition could be carried out by adding $\frac{1}{15}$ to the weight of each grain in every unit composed of grains, or by adding $\frac{1}{15}$ in numbers to any one group of such units—viz. by raising the number of wheat grains from 30 to 32, keeping the weight of grains the same, or by raising the 16 solidi of 15 to 16 solidi of 16 (see note to Form 12). In the entry in Domesday 'inter Ripam' the Mercian solidi are 16 of 16 of 30 grains of '0486 gramme, instead of 16 of 16 of 30 grains of '0455625; but in Guthrum's Treaty the unit itself is raised from 30 wheat

grains to 32 of the same grains '0486, and the 16 solidi of 15 of 30 such grains become 16 solidi of 15 of 32 grains—*i.e.* 48 sol. ex v. scl. denariis, each denarius being 32 wheat grains (*i.e.* the Troy penny of 24 Troy grains). That the words 'aureus' and 'solidus' were synonymous, see 'Leges Agrariæ,' p. 323.

ATTIC DRACHMA 4'373 GRAMMES.

No. 1. (Grammes 349'87.) Tower pound of 5400 Troy grains or 80 Attic drachmæ of 4'373.

No. of Troy grs.	No. of gram.	
'703125	'0455625	Wheat = $\frac{1}{2}$ Chalcus of Form 12.
1'40625	'091125	2 Chalcus.
4'21875	'273375	6 3 Hemibolus.
8'4375	'54675	12 6 2 Obolus.
21'09375	1'366875	30 15 5 2½ Denarius.
84'375	5'4675	120 60 20 10 4 Thrimæ.
337'5	21'87	480 240 80 40 16 4 Solidus or aureus.
675	43'74	960 480 160 80 32 8 2 Two aurei or 10 drachmæ.
5400	549'92	7680 3840 1280 640 256 64 16 8 (Libra of 80 drachmæ.

This is according to Forms 11 and 12. Equals 60 thrimæ of 5'832 grammes.

No. 2. (Grammes 349'87. Tower pound. Decimal division into 60 Thrimæ, 80 Attic drachmæ of 4'373 grammes).

No. of Troy grs.	No. of gram.	
'703125	'0455625	Wheat, or half Chalcus, Form 12.
1'40625	'091125	2 Chalci.
11'25	'729	16 8 Obolus.
22'5	1'458	32 16 2 Denarius (3 = drachma).
90*	5'832*	128** 64 8 4 Thrimæ (** = 120 of '0486 gramme).
270	17'496	384 192 24 12 3 Solidus.
5400	349'92	7680 3840 480 240 60 20 Libra (60 thrimæ) or
90*	5'832**	128 64 8 4 Thrimæ (** = 120 of '0486).
450	29'16	640 320 40 20 5 Solidus or uncia.
5400	349'87	7680 3840 480 240 60 12 Libra (60 Thrimæ).

This is according to Forms 11 and 12.

* See No. 5.

No. 3. (*Grammes 349·87.*) *Tower pound as above, Saxon division, 80 drachmæ of 4·373 grammes.*

No. of Troy grs.	No. of gram.	
·781	·050625	Wheat 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ Chalcus.
3·124	·2025	4 Carat or Double Chalcus or Siliqua ; see Form 10.
9·372	·6075	12 3 Obolus.
18 $\frac{3}{4}$	1·215	24 6 2 Penig or scruple.
56 $\frac{1}{4}$	3·645	72 18 6 3 Drachmæ of 3·645.
75	4·86	96 24 8 4 1 $\frac{1}{8}$ Scilling or solidus.
450	29·16	576 144 48 24 8 6 Ounce of 24 peninga.
5400	349·87	6912 1728 576 288 96 72 12 Libra of 96 drachmæ of 3·645 or 80 of 4·373.

This is according to Form 9. Equals 60 Thrimsæ of 5·832 grammes.

No. 4. (*Grammes 373·2.*) *Troy pound 80 Eubæan drachmæ. Mercian sexdecimal division into 64 Thrimsæ and into 8 oboli of 6 chalci each to the drachma. Troy grain = ·0648 of a gramme.*

No. of Troy grs.	No. of gram.	
·75	·0486	Wheat grains or $\frac{1}{2}$ Chalcus.
1·5	·0972	2 Chalcus.
4·5	·2916	6 3 Hemiobolus.
22·5	1·458	30 15 5 Denarius.
90	5·832	120 60 20 4 Thrimsæ.
360	23·328	480 240 80 16 4 Solidus or aureus (ora) denari- orum.
720	46·656	960 480 160 32 8 2 Mancus, '2 oræ denariorum' or 10 drachmæ.
5760	373·248	7680 3840 1280 256 64* 16 8 (Libra of 80 drachmæ of 4·6656).

This is according to Forms 12 and 11.

TROY POUND.

No. 5. (*Grammes 373·248*) *80 Eubæan drachmæ of 6 oboli of 8 chalci to drachma. Troy grain = ·0648 gramme. Treaty division between Alfred and Guthrum.*

No. of Troy grs.	No. of gram.	
·75	·0486	Wheat grain or $\frac{1}{2}$ Chalcus of Form 12.
1·5	·0972	2 Chalcus.
12	·7776	16 8 Obolus.
24	1·5552	32 16 2 Denarius or penny.
120	7·776	160 80 10 5 Solidus 'ex 5 scil. denariis;' see Treaty
720	46·656	960 480 60 30 6 Mancus or 10 drachmæ.
5760	373·248	7680 3840 480 240 48 8 (Libra of 80 drachmæ of 4·6656).

Equals 64 Thrimsæ of 5·832 grammes ; so that in the Ceorls 'were' of 4 pounds

606 SUMMARY OF A 'NEW VIEW OF THE GELDABLE

and 40 pence of this division there are $266\frac{2}{3}$ thrimsæ. (See Guthrum's Treaty, set in my paper in vol. i. 'Domesday Studies'), page 245.

No. 6. (*Grammes 373·248*) 80 *Eubæan drachmæ*, decimal division into 6 oboli of 8 chalci to the drachma. Troy grain = ·0648 gramme.

No. of Troy grs.	No. of gram.								
·75	·0486	Wheat grain or $\frac{1}{2}$ Chalcus of Form 12.							
1	·0648	$1\frac{1}{3}$ Troy grain.							
$1\frac{1}{2}$	·0972	2	$1\frac{1}{2}$ Chalcus.						
12	·7776	16	12	8 Obolus.					
24	1·5552	32	24	16	2 Diobolus or penny.				
120	7·776	160	120	80	10	5 Solidus 'ex 5 scil. denariis'; see Treaty			
80	31·104	640	480	320	40	20	4 Aureus, solidus, or 'ora de viginti in ora,' or ounce		
720	46·656	960	720	480	60	30	6 $1\frac{1}{2}$ Mancus or 10 drachmæ.		
5760	373·248	7680	5760	3840	480	240	48 12 8 Libra or 80 drachmæ of 4·6656.		

Equals 64 Thrimsæ of 5·832 grammes.

No. 7. *Roman, Anglo-Saxon, or Duodecimal divisions.* (*Grammes 373·248*) 80 *Eubæan drachmæ* of 4·6656 = 96 drachmæ of 3·888, 6 oboli of 3 carats to drachma.

No. of Troy grs.	No. of gram.									
$\frac{5}{6}$	·054	Wheat $\frac{1}{2}$ Chalci of Form 10.								
$3\frac{1}{3}$	·216	4 Carat.								
10	·648	12	3 Obolus.							
20	1·296	24	6	2 Diobolus, scruple, penny.						
60	3·888	72	18	6	3 Drachmæ.					
120	7·776*	144	36	12	6	2 * 'Solidus or sicilicus ex 5 sch. denariis ; ' see decimal division above.				
480	31·104	576	144	48	24	8	4 Aureus, solidus, or 'ora de viginti in ora' = ounce.			
720	46·656	864	216	72	36	12	6	1½ Mancus or 12 drachmæ.		
5760	373·248	6912	1728	576	288	96	48	12 8 Libra or 96 drachmæ.		
A		B	of 3·888 = 80 drachmæ of 4·6656.							

Column A is the same as Apothecaries' weight, being the same as B but with half chalcus or Troy grain of ·648 instead of the half chalcus Form 10, ·054, the latter being ten-twelfths of the Troy.

It is thus absolutely necessary, as stated in my paper in vol. i., to have a correct understanding of the difference in number and weight of the primary units which lie at the base of any given ounce or pound, whatever name such units may bear.

In the East, at Constantinople, the Kharouba (carob, siliqua, or carat) of '20108 gramme consisted of 4 wheat grains, or half chalci, each of '05027 gramme, and at Tripoli and Bassora the Kharouba of '1944 gramme consisted of 3 Troy grains or half chalci of '0648 gramme each: supposing, however, the Kharouba at Tripoli and Bassora to have equalled 4 wheat grains as at Constantinople, then the Tripoli wheat grain or half chalci must have been '0486 gramme, being the identical wheat grain (or $\frac{1}{2}$ chalci of '0455625 + $\frac{1}{16}$ of it: see below) of the Mercian pound or double mark of 7680 such grains. (See vol. i. p. 233.) The wheat grains of the Troy pound are said in the statute of Edward to be 'medio spice,' those of the Tower pound are in Fleta, book ii. c. 12, said to be 'mediocria.'

The Roman unit, siliqua, or carob, consisted of 4 half chalci, and the half pinginn consisted also of 4 half chalci, whatever their respective weights might have been.

We know as an absolute fact that the Tower pound is 5400 Troy grains, and that the Troy grain is '064792 of a gramme; the weight, therefore, of the Tower pound is 349'87 grammes; the Troy pound we also know to be Troy 5760 grains (that is 373'248): the difference between the two pounds, therefore, is one *fifteenth*, the Tower pound being 349'87 grammes.

Hultsch (p. 705), as I have said, gives the weight of the *Attic drachma* at 4'366, which would therefore consist of 48 chalci of '091 each, or 96 halves of chalci of '0455 gramme. Taking *ten* drachmæ to an *ounce*, we shall have an ounce of 43'66 grammes, consisting of 480 chalci or 960 halves of chalci. Taking again 8 of these ounces, we have 3840 chalci or 7680 halves of chalci of '0455 gramme and an Attic 'mark' of 349'28, being, with a difference of only 10 grains (Troy), an amount so near to the Tower pound of 349'98 as to justify an assumption that the Attic 'mark' and the Tower pound are

identical. This mark of 8 ounces of 43·66 each would therefore equal 16 ounces of 21·83 of 480 halves of chalci each, or 12 ounces of 640 halves of chalci each (= 29·16).

Assuming, then, that the ounce of the Tower pound of 5400 Troy grains (which equal a 'mark' of 8 ounces of 10 Attic drachmæ each) was really the ounce of the Anglo-Saxon pound, as it certainly is that of the Cologne and other Teutonic weights mentioned below; and assuming also that the Saxons had the same *divisions* as the Romans and the Irish, as suggested in vol. i. pp. 239, 240, in the paragraph headed 'The Libra and Mercian Mark;' then the Saxon penig would have contained *before* the treaty with Guthrum 24 half chalci, Form 10, of '050625 gramme each or 20 of '06075 half chalci, Form 8—see entries marked D in Tower pound, table *ante* (= 18 $\frac{3}{4}$ Troy of '0648 gramme, as stated at p. 237), and *after* the treaty (and after this Tower pound for the purpose of the treaty had been raised a fifteenth—that is, from 5400 Troy grains to 5760 Troy grains) would have contained 20 Troy grains (see E), six of which would amount to the five denarii which made the treaty shilling, each denarius being 24 grains Troy of '06492 gramme = 32 wheat grains of '0485 gramme, and the *treaty* pound (*i.e.* the Troy pound) would thus be divided duodecimally by the Anglo-Saxons as in Apothecaries' weight, while the Normans would divide it decimally as in Troy weight, and the Mercians sexdecimally as in the valets of the land 'inter Ripam' at page 248, vol. i. (see Tables *ante*).

As it is not reasonable to suppose that a weight would be subdivided originally in such a way as to produce a fraction of its primary unit, we may safely conclude that where a subdivision does so produce a fraction it is a subdivision brought about by the adoption of another and different weight. The marks of 8 ounces and 16 halves of ounces (or two thirds of 12 ounces) would represent in the duodecimal system 192 and 384

pence or units, and in the decimal system 160 and 320; but sometimes these marks were themselves divided duodecimally and decimally: for instance, the Attic 'mark' of 8 ounces divides duodecimally up into the Tower pound, and the Mercian mark of 16 solidi divides decimally into the Troy pound as well as duodecimally, as shown above.

As the Attic drachma of 4·3665 (see *ante*), the Tower pound of 5400 Troy grains (equalling 80 of such drachmæ), the chalcus of '091125, the $\frac{1}{2}$ chalcus of '0455625, the wheat grain of '0486, the Troy grain of '064792, are all thoroughly identified, there is very strong ground for thinking (as stated in my paper in vol. i.) that there existed in England *before* the advent of the Saxons a weight divided sexdecimally (*i.e.* $16 \times 16 \times 30$, or 7680 grains); that such grains were halves of chalci of '091125 = '0455625; that this weight was the Tower pound divided afterwards by the Anglo-Saxons duodecimally instead of sexdecimally; and that, being $16 \times 16 \times 30$ of '0455625, it equalled *fifteen* ounces of 16 pence of 30 wheat grains of '0486, and that this weight was at the treaty of Guthrum raised $\frac{1}{15}$ (that is from *fifteen* ounces to *sixteen* ounces of such last-mentioned grains), and became what I call the Mercian pound or mark of $16 \times 16 \times 30$ halves of chalci, or wheat grains of '0486 gramme = $12 \times 24 \times 20$ of '0648 (Troy grains) = $12 \times 20 \times 24$ of the like grains. The Troy grain is really '064792, but I have taken it as '0648.

The important question remains behind: Did the Saxons when they came to England bring this Attic 'mark' with them, or did they find it here, treat it as an as or unit, and divide it according to their system duodecimally? For the reason given in my paper in vol. i. I think they found it here, and that binary or sexdecimal divisions as contained in the Attic mark were in use among the British in accordance with the like divisions of the land used by Dyvnmal before the Saxons 'obtained the crown of London and the supremacy in England.'

The following are the grains or units in grammes: Troy, chalcus, '129584, ditto '0972, the halves of which are respectively '064792 and '0486 (this last being the wheat grain of Edward's statute).

Since I wrote my paper in vol. i. I have found ample confirmation of the meaning of the word *wara* and its consequent bearing on the calculation of areas at the time of 'Domesday Book.' Also that much land in a time anterior to 'Domesday Book' had been allotted out by a people using 12×12 as well as 12×10 , and that in order to get a uniform assessment, one-sixth (or sextula) of the area was put aside *extra hidam* untaxed and unnoticed in 'Domesday Book.' The same cardinal principle prevailed of old as now that nothing (which *valet nil*) *stat ad geldum*: for instance, no *common* land, arable or pasture, at the time of 'Domesday Book' or at the present day found or finds its way into an income-tax schedule or a rate book; none the less did and does it exist and increase the area of a manor or a parish. The words 'an acre of wara' meant an acre of land with a part sown, and therefore taxed, and a part unsown, and therefore untaxed, *quia jacet in communi et valet nil* (see vol. i. p. 348).

The word *wara* has no relation to defence or enclosure or to the word *wár* or *wárian* (to defend), but the word *wara* (without the accent) means of and belonging to the inhabitants; see Bosworth's 'Anglo-Saxon and English Dictionary,' edit. 1881, p. 245, *s. voc.* 'Wara of inhabitants,' genitive plural of *waru*, not defence, but 'a collective noun in the s. denoting the city or town authority or corporation, the city, town, or country, that is, the inhabitants of a town, city, or country, as a body'; see Bosworth, same page. Wara, therefore, if Bosworth is right, means anything belonging to or held in common by the inhabitants of a certain place or manor, and if applied to land it would mean neither more nor less than the

'common fields,' the fields *jacentes in communi* of such a manor. And this is the simple solution : if (when the land was *originally set out*) an acre of wara (*i.e.* of the common fields) was given to a man in a two-course shift, at the time of the allotment he would have an acre in each of two fields ; if the three-course shift was in vogue, he would have three, *i.e.* one in each of three fields. Such an allotment *in area* would never change, though in case of an *original* allotment, say a virgate or plena terra of twelve acres in each of two fields, when the whole area was rearranged in three fields instead of two, the same man who originally held twelve acres in each of two fields would then hold eight acres in each of three fields, though he would not thereby increase or change the place of his holding, and though his manorial records might still speak of his holding as twelve acres of wara.

The common fields of a township in the old charters are spoken of therein as *waru* and *ut-waru* in several cases.

The shift from the two-course to the three-course without altering the area of the separate holdings would be easy enough when we remember that the land was held *dispersim* in roods and acres interspersed among each other. Luckily, since I wrote my paper, I have found an entry in the Court Rolls of the manor of Winston, in Suffolk, which seems to put the matter beyond doubt. The roll is in the muniment-room of the Dean and Chapter of Ely, where anyone, I have no doubt, would gladly be permitted to see it. The entry is as follows :—

Wynston. Curia ibidem tenta die Martis in crastino sanctæ Katherinæ anno regni regis Edwardi (tertii) post conquestum quinto.

Rogerus Langhawe qui tenuit de domino unum messuagium et quatuor acras wara terræ quæ se extendunt ad xii acras mensuras per perticam xvi pedum et dimidiæ in villenagio diem suum nuper clausit extremum, etc.

In regard to this roll I merely remark that at Winston

there were three 'common fields' or wara fields, and that a man holding four acres in each would hold twelve acres in area, *i.e.* four acres of wara, of which eight would be taxed and four untaxed, '*quia jacent in communi et valent nil.*' Also that I can conceive no expression more like indicating a lot of strips spread over three fields than the expression *se extendentes ad 12 acras*. Among the numerous cases I have met with, the following illustrates in a very compact form the deduction of $\frac{1}{3}$ (fallow) in a three-course manor, viz. 'Ramsey Chartulary,' vol. i. p. 398, Rypton Abbas, '*Tres hydæ soke-mannorum quæ continent viginti duo virgatas et dimidiam. Viginti quatuor acræ faciunt virgatam.*' There are $22\frac{1}{2}$ (not 20) by actual counting. Now $22\frac{1}{2} \times 24 = 540 = 3$ hides of $120 = 360$ with 180 fallow '*jaçentes in communi et valentes nil*' and therefore deducted. I have a strong suspicion that in some cases in the thirteenth-century MSS. the fallow land is not mentioned at all as in 'Domesday Book' (see the cases of Rypton Abbas, and Stivekel in the 'Ramsey Chartulary'), and that 80 means taxed land with 40 of fallow '*jaçentes in communi*,' and therefore unnoticed as in 'Domesday Book.'

The *one* geldable hide of 120 was reached by shrinking in favour of the Angli 144 to 120 (see page 352, vol. i.). The king's officers took off the 144 a sixth or sextula. Certainly, it is true, by expanding the 100 to 120 you get the same result; but it is not a question as between 100 and 120, but as between 120 and 144. Nothing could show plainer that it is so than the Shelford entry, where '*tenet*' $7\frac{1}{2}$ in the Hundred Rolls for taxation represents the area of 9 in Norman numeration in the contemporaneous survey, and $16 \times 7\frac{1}{2} = 120$ and $16 \times 9 = 144$ (see vol. i. pp. 357, 358). There are several of the like cases in 'Domesday Book' (see vol. i. p. 350 and the case of Ellingtune at p. 357). The 'Ramsey Chartulary' says that 6 areal virgates of 24 in the place made the area of *one* hide. The Hundred Rolls, however, say 5 of 24, thus reducing

6 to 5, and 144 to 120. This reduction of a sextula, *i.e.* 144 to 120, began long before 'Domesday,' and the surplusage of $\frac{1}{6}$ is in one place called *super hidam*. I call it, as does the 'Domesday' of St. Paul, *extra hidam*. The passage I allude to is at p. 129 of Stewart's 'Historia Eliensis.' There had been a dispute about some land, so they took to a measuring thus described :—

Mane itaque facto hinc et inde quam plures videlicet de hominibus abbatis et de hominibus mulieris. Qui primum circumeuntes mensi sunt terram quæ absque calumpnia erat et non inveniunt de terra quæ mulieris jure fuisset nisi unam hydram per sexies xx acras et super hydram xxiiij acras.

So this 144 acres would only pass for *one integra hyda*, and the 120 of the 144 would be the *hid mæl*, and the 24 the *æcer mæl*.

Again, what Æthelwold bought shortly before (see Stewart's 'Historia Eliensis,' p. 116) as xii. hydæ is immediately after, in Edgar's contemporaneous charter, called one *particula ruris* of x. cassatos, and to such charter is a terrier in Anglo-Saxon, which speaks of it as lying *hid mælum* and *æcer mælum*, the acre portion being, no doubt, the 24 acres *extra hydram* attached to the *hid mæl*, *i.e.* to each hide of 120.

But there is another entry in the 'Leges Regis Edwardi Confessoris,' par. xxxiii. to be found in the ancient 'Laws and Institutes of England,' London, 1840, vol. i. pp. 456, 457, which leaves the matter in no doubt and which runs thus : '*Erat etiam Lex Danorum Northfolc Suthfolc Cantibrugescire que habebat in emendacionem foris facturæ ubi supradicti comitatus habebant xviii hundreda isti x et dimidium. Et hoc affinitate Saxonum quia tunc temporis major emendacio foris facturæ Saxonum erat quater xx lib. et iiii.*' By Cap. iii. of Ethelred, p. 293, we find the emendacio or 'bot' was to be made *with xii hundred* (*i.e.* a unit of xii, so xviii would be $1\frac{1}{2}$ units, as

also *x et dimidium*, *i.e.* 15), and in the note C is contained an illustration from the Laws of the Confessor thus: '*verbi gratia in Danelaga per xviii hundreda qui numerus complet septies viginti libras et quatuor quoniam foris facturam hundredi. Dani Norwegienses viii lib habebant. Multiplicatis igitur octo per octo decem faciunt centum et quadraginta quatuor.*' Taking eight pounds per hundred and the 'bot' to be made with a unit of xii hundred, it gives 8 into xii, *i.e.* one unit = 4×24 and 8×18 , *i.e.* $1\frac{1}{2}$ units = $144 = 6 \times 24$; but taking the numeration indicated by the words *isti x et dimidium* these numbers would become 8 into x, *i.e.* one unit = 4×20 and 8×15 , *i.e.* $1\frac{1}{2}$ units = $120 = 6 \times 20$, and this too on the threshold of 'Domesday Book.' Equally plain are the statements contained in the Laws of Ina, c. 64, 65, 66, where the halves of xx, x, and iii are shown to be xii, vi, and $1\frac{1}{2}$. See p. 145 in the same volume, and also at p. 19, c. 61 of the Laws of Æthelbirht (note b) the 24 solidi of the Lex Alamannorum are rendered xx. Bearing this in mind, it will be well to recall the fact, easily proved by the inspection of 'Domesday,' how many manors are therein marked ('*signantur*') as containing x, xx, xxx hides, especially in Cambridgeshire, Huntingdonshire, and Yorkshire (see vol. i. pp. 252, 253).

I have compared so many MSS. now that I am driven to the conclusion that you cannot trust MSS. that state areas in decimals, *i.e.* decunces; for instance, take the case of the Stivekel 'Ramsey Chartulary,' vol. i. p. 392. The virgate is put at 24, but in the Hundred Rolls, vol. ii. p. 299, it is stated at 20 (*i.e.* a sextula less), which would be the taxed portion, *i.e.* $6 \times 20 = 120$, instead of 6×24 . MSS. speaking in twelves, or dimidiæ sextulæ, are not open to this distrust; see *ante*, vol. i. p. 132.

No better instances than the following can be given as to the reduction from areas counted as 12×12 originally to that of 'Domesday Book,' viz. a counting of 12×10 , and also of the

ignoring of the fallow '*jacens in communi*,' both working together in the same area. I mean the case of Stretham, before 'Domesday Book,' in Stewart's 'Historia Eliensis,' pp. 119, 120. The abbot has 9 hidæ, but in 'Domesday Book' he is assessed only at 5. If $\frac{1}{3}$ is taken off for fallow, '*jacens in communi*,' in a three-course, the 9 is reduced to 6, and taking off a sixth (12 to 10), we get 5 hides at which it is assessed. At Wilburton, by a 'Liber Eliensis' of 1221 (Cott. MS. 'Tiberius,' book ii.), there is an area of 162 acres (81 of wara), held by 9 *libere tenentes* or *hundredarii*; 162 divided by 9 gives 18, and applying the above principles we should get only 10 acres (in the 18) of *taxed* land. Thus, take off $\frac{1}{3}$ for fallow '*jacens in communi*,' it leaves 12, and off that a sixth and 10 results, so that the 9 of 18 becomes for taxation 9 of 10, *i.e.* the '9 *villani quisque de x. acris*,' as in the 'Inquisitio Eliensis' and 'Domesday Book.' I am driven to the conclusion that the area under the plough of the time of 'Domesday Book' has been fearfully understated, as also the population (see vol. i. pp. 360, 361). We are apt to forget that between the withdrawal of the Romans and 'Domesday Book' was a period of 600 years (*i.e.* as long as from now to Edward I.), and to suppose that any very great portion of the land that we find in cultivation by the MSS. of the middle of the thirteenth century was brought into cultivation since 'Domesday Book' is falsely to suppose—what is fresh is generally marked '*de assarto*.'

It remains to state what can be gathered from Bede as to the duodecimal system. At p. 111 of the Cologne edition of 1612 of Bede, and the 'Glossa Bridferti Ramesiensis' there appear the reasons why '*unitas*,' or *oneness*, when applied to things that are capable of division or aggregation should have different values in different systems—why, for instance, *one*, or *unitas*, might mean an aggregation into *one whole* of 12 things or of 10 things, so that the tenth part of the one system should

mean $1\frac{1}{5}$ of the other, and thus 100 would mean 120, 10 would mean 12, 5 mean 6, and $7\frac{1}{2}$ mean 9. At pp. 114 to 122 are given tables headed '*De Ratione Calculi*' illustrating the method of multiplications up to 16 (*se-decupli*), but all starting, not from 1, or *unitas*, but from $\frac{1}{12}$. At p. 111, Cologne edition, 1612, Bede says:—

That oneness whence proceed all aggregations of numbers which belongs properly to the exercise of arithmetic, since in reality it is simple and does not consist at all in aggregation of parts, does not admit of any division at all. But as to the rest, though there is in things something of such a kind that on account of its wholeness and solidity it deserves to be called by the name of oneness, yet since it is a compound it will necessarily be liable to division. And for this reason, because it is made up not of simplicity, but of compounds. On the scale of this division the ancients used such a system of calculation in measuring that by it every whole thing could be divided by a rational division whether that which was put forward for division were corporeal or an incorporeal thing. In this system the As is called *unitas*, and its parts called by appropriate names, *ad infinitum* according to their proportion.

Bede, at p. 111, under the head '*Modus Calculi*,' illustrates this where he says, '*Incipiendum que a dimidia sextula per duplicationem usque ad II, id est duo millia.*' The *dimidia sextula* being in fact the twelfth part of the As or oneness, *i.e.* of one pound, one hide, one manor, one hundred, one man's holding, one virgate, one group of ploughs, acres or any other things capable of aggregation, so the *duo millia* would really be 24,000 *dimidiæ sextulæ* in the duodecimal system, and 20,000 in the decimal. In the '*Glossa Bridferti Ramesiensis*,' p. 143 of the above edition of Bede, it is thus stated:—

Quicquid in 10 partiri vis decem ejus partes simul decuncis nomen accipiunt similiter ejus

$$\text{pars} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 10 \\ 9 \\ 8 \end{array} \right. \text{nuncupatur} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{decunx} \\ \text{dodrans} \\ \text{besse} \end{array} \right.$$

similiter quicquid in novem partiri vis omnes partes simul nomen dodrantis tenent.

It follows, therefore, that a oneness, or *unitas* (one pound, one hundred, &c.), divided into 10 parts would be $\frac{12}{10}$ and would be called a *decunx*, a name, however, properly applicable to 10 only of 12 parts, instead of 12 things separated into 10. This is fully borne out by Bede's statement at p. 142, under the heading '*Divisio per Uncias*': *Libera as sive assis est unciarum duodecim et signatur ita X.*' just as the one *particula ruris* of 12 hidæ in 'Edgar's Charter' above is called x. cassati. So, too, the statement in 'Domesday Book' that '*hic numerus Anglice computatur, i.e. centum pro cxx.*' must mean x. decunces, i.e. $10 \times 10 \times \frac{12}{10}$; so, too, the Shelford one man's holding of $7\frac{1}{2} \times \frac{12}{10} = 9$, $5 \times \frac{12}{10} = 6$, and all the other instances that are to be found, and that I have referred to where there has been found an opportunity of comparing contemporaneous MSS. So also the real *dodrans* of the one cubit rod marked A, B, C, vol. i. p. 255, would be $7\frac{1}{2}$, $8\frac{1}{4}$, and 9 respectively in regard to its respective cubits, and would be equally well expressed by any of the three.

The same principle that governed the Saxons when they refused to join the Lombards (see *ante*, vol. i. p. 260) evidently prevailed in England when they took over the land there, and it appears more than probable that the original *Anglo-Saxon dimidiæ sextulæ* that formed their *as* or *unit* are in very many, if not most, old MSS. stated in *decunces*, not only in regard to one hundred, but also in other aggregations into a *unit*, so that one man's holding at Shelford of 9 *dimidiæ sextulæ* is written in the contemporaneous MS. as $7\frac{1}{2}$ (*decunces*), and this as late as 1279 (see vol. i. p. 357).

I have no doubt that by degrees the 72, the 36, the 18, the 9, &c. *dimidiæ sextulæ* were written and accepted as only 60, 30, 15, $7\frac{1}{2}$, &c. It mattered not when taxation &c. proceeded on the

lines of *unities*, *one* hundred, *one* manor, *one* virgate, *one* plough-land, *one* man's holding, whether these *unities* were treated as aggregations of *dimidia sextulæ* or of *decunces*, though it does matter a great deal to us of a later generation in calculating areas; the singular thing is that the reality and true meaning of the *long hundred* in regard to *one* hundred has hitherto been entirely overlooked as regards other *unities*, such as $7\frac{1}{2}$ 10, 15, 20, 30, &c. (see vol. i. p. 352). Notwithstanding there are in the Cologne edition of Bede, as above stated, eight big pages of calculations all starting, not from *unity*, but from its twelfth part, *i.e.* the *dimidia sextula*, two ditto being marked thus *s*—three *.s*.—four *.ss*—five *.ss*.—six *s*—seven *s*.—eight *ss*—nine *ss*.—ten *sss*—eleven *sss*.—twelve 1; so that it will be found in the column headed 'Nonecupli' that *nine* into ten is stated to be, not nine, but $7s$, that is $7\frac{1}{2}$, the inevitable conclusion being that where one manuscript, as at Shelford, vol. i. 357, states one man's holding to be $7\frac{1}{2}$ acres, and a contemporaneous MS. states the same to be 9, the first either reckons in decunces, *i.e.* giving 192 poles to the acre, or, as I put it, totally disregards (as extra hidam) the difference of $1\frac{1}{2}$ acres and thus concedes apparently what the Lombards would not concede: this concession, therefore, has to be reckoned with in all Anglo-Saxon settlements in this country when a calculation has to be made as to the size and manner of their allotments, and it must not be taken as gospel that when a MS. states a virgate to be xxx. acres &c. it includes all the land in the virgate, for it very likely is the case that it really is 36 *dimidia sextulæ*, *i.e.* acres.

ERRATA TO THE LAST PAPER IN VOL. I.

Instead of the explanation of the cord of 29 feet at P. 282, read that of the diagram p. 285-6 and p. 372.

P. 255, for '3408 m. read '3048.

„ 256, for *agris* read *agri*.

„ 274, for '288 m. read '2286 m.

- P. 294, *for* 10·9 m. *read* 109 m.
 „ 311, *for* duodecimal *read* sexdecimal.
 „ 377, No. 64, *for* F *read* ·307 m.
 „ 377, No. 70, *for* Roman Stadium *read* Stadium of 720 of ·296 foot.
 „ 383, Russia, *for* 5 Roman Stadia *read* Stadia „ „
 „ 384, *for* ·594 m. *read* ·574 m. Dantzic.
 „ 385, Hanover, *for* 160 rods *read* 120 rods.

The moggia of Naples (p. 382) needs revision. It seems to be (one-tenth of an Attic Stadion) $18\cdot48 \times 184\cdot8$, *i.e.* 70×700 of ·264 m. = 60×600 of 308 m. or $34\cdot15$ Ares. If it really is $33\cdot451$ Ares ('Cambist,' p. 264) it is one-tenth of a Devonshire quarantene of $18\cdot28 \times 182$ m. But the Egyptian span of ·264 m. is to the Attic foot of ·308 m. as 6 to 7.

P. 233, line 13, *for* 7680 Troy grains *read* 6750 Troy grains.

Domesday Commemoration

1886

NOTES ON THE MANUSCRIPTS &c. EXHIBITED

AT H.M. PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE

Domesday Book.

THIS remarkable record, the oldest and most valuable survey among the national archives, was formerly kept by the side of the Tally Court, in the Receipt of the Exchequer, under three locks and keys, in charge of the Auditor, the Chamberlains, and Deputy-Chamberlains of the Exchequer, till, in 1696, it was deposited with the other records in the Chapter House at Westminster. In 1859 it was transferred to the Public Record Office.

Domesday Book consists of two volumes, of different sizes and appearance. The first, in folio, contains the counties of Bedford, Berks, Bucks, Cambridge, Chester and Lancaster, Cornwall, Derby, Devon, Dorset, Gloucester, Hants, Hereford, Herts, Huntingdon, Kent, Leicester and Rutland, Lincoln, Middlesex, Northampton, Nottingham, Oxford, Salop, Somerset, Stafford, Surrey, Sussex, Warwick, Wilts, Worcester, and York. The second volume, in quarto, contains the counties of Essex, Norfolk, and Suffolk.

The larger volume contains 382 leaves of parchment, with five old fly-leaves at the beginning and four at the end. The leaves measure $14\frac{1}{2}$ in. by $9\frac{3}{4}$ in., and are mostly in quaternions of eight leaves, though this is not invariable. The rubbed and worn look of the first and last leaves of the portion for each county appears to indicate that these portions were kept separate for some time before being bound together

in one volume. All the counties, however, do not begin a separate sheet, Cheshire being an instance to the contrary. There are three pages smaller than the rest (ff. 42, 76, 81). These are pieces of parchment added to complete a portion which could not be got into the space allotted for it. One is a scrap cut off a page already ruled, and used with the lines vertical. Another (f. 81) has been inserted in the wrong place, and should be between ff. 82 and 83. Lines are ruled on the pages with a dry point, and on the margin may be seen the small holes made by the 'runner' used as a guide for the ruler. The number of lines varies from 50 to 59, but the writing does not always keep to them, so that the lines of writing sometimes exceed in number the lines ruled, no doubt to rectify a miscalculation of the space allotted for the entries. *See* ff. 72 *b*, 154.

The page is divided into two columns, and perpendicular lines are ruled to mark the margins and central space, which are not always accurately observed. Blank pages, such as folio 126, distinctly show the method of ruling.

The writing is very clear, the letters being all distinctly and separately formed; and any difficulty which is experienced in reading the book arises only from the abbreviations, the same mark of contraction being often used to represent widely different syllables.

There is no ornament, but the name of the county is written at the head of each page, in red, and a dash of the same colour is used to heighten capital letters.

The names of places are also emphasized by a red line running through the middle of the letters.

In several places there are omissions and additions in the side and bottom margins, the passages to which they refer being indicated by marks (ff. 45 *b*, 60, 61, 61 *b*, 98 *b*, 102, 103, 106 *b*, 165 *b*, 166 *b*, 238 *b*, 282 *b*, 289, etc.) and there are some erasures and alterations (ff. 63 *b*, 67, 91).

Some of the marginal notes—as at ff. 48, 48 *b*, 72 col. 2, 74, 102—appear to be subsequent additions.

The same scribe was not employed throughout, Derbyshire and Yorkshire and the 'Feodum Rotberti de Bruis' (f. 332 *b*) being noticeably in a different handwriting. At the County of Lincoln, however, the original hand recurs.

The fly-leaves contain memoranda of various kinds and dates, made by officers of the Exchequer, and an extent of lands and an inquisition, both original documents of the thirteenth century, have been inlaid in one leaf.

Vol. II. is of a smaller size, the leaves being 10½ in. by 6½ in. The parchment is mostly of a coarser character, and the writing, which is by several hands and more cursive, is generally larger than that of Vol. I. The lines are marked in the same way, but are farther apart, the number in a page varying from 20 to 28, except in the case of two leaves (229 and 230) inserted in the middle of 'Norfolk,' which have 40 lines. The point used for ruling has sometimes cut through the parchment. There is no division into columns. The varying quality of the parchment, and the frequent changes of handwriting, suggest that the volume is composed by binding together a quantity of separately prepared returns, rather than by transcribing them. The red colour employed is of a different kind from that in Vol. I., and is much more sparingly used. There are one or two clumsy attempts at ornamental capitals, but of no artistic value.

The survey was probably commenced late in 1085, and completed in 1086, according to the colophon in the second volume :

'Anno millesimo octogesimo sexto ab incarnatione Domini vicesimo vero regni Willelmi facta est ista descriptio non solum per hos tres comitatus sed etiam per alios.'

'On any hypothesis,' says Eyton, 'as to the time taken by the different processes which resulted in Domesday Book, the

whole, that is the survey, the transcription, and the codification, were completed in less than eight months, and three of the eight were winter months. No such miracle of clerkly and executive capacity has been worked in England since.' The Commissioners appointed to make the survey were to inquire the name of each place ; who held it in the time of King Edward the Confessor ; the present possessor ; how many hides were in the manor ; how many ploughs were in the demesne ; how many homagers ; how many villeins ; how many cottars ; how many serving men ; how many free tenants ; how many tenants in soccage ; how much wood, meadow, and pasture ; the number of mills and fish ponds ; what had been added to or taken away from the place, and how much each free man or soc-man had. All this was to be triply estimated : First, as the estate was held in the time of the Confessor ; then, as it was bestowed by King William ; thirdly, as its value stood at the formation of the survey ; and it was to be stated whether any increase could be made in the value.

The inquiries having been taken were sent to Winchester, and were there methodized and enrolled in the form we now see them.

For some reason left unexplained, many parts were not surveyed. Northumberland, Cumberland, Westmoreland, and Durham are not described in the survey ; nor does Lancashire appear under its proper name ; but Furness, and the northern part of Lancashire, as well as the south of Westmoreland, with a part of Cumberland, are included within the West Riding of Yorkshire. That part of Lancashire which lies between the Ribble and the Mersey, and which at the time of the survey comprehended six hundreds and one hundred and eighty-eight manors, is joined to Cheshire. Part of Rutland is described in the counties of Northampton and Lincoln.

The printed edition of 'Domesday' was commenced in

1773, and was completed early in 1783. (*See THE BIBLIOGRAPHY OF DOMESDAY BOOK, post, p. et seq.*)

The old *+Domesday+* Covers.

These are the covers in which 'Domesday' was bound when it was deposited at the Chapter House, Westminster. The foundation is of wood, apparently of considerable antiquity; but the metal work does not appear to be earlier than the seventeenth century. In that depository russia leather covers were substituted for these old ones. After their transfer to the Public Record Office the two volumes had to be taken to pieces for the purposes of the facsimile reproduction of the text by photo-zincography; and on their return from Southampton, they were placed in the present bindings. The work was carried out by Rivière in 1869.

In Devon's 'Issues of the Exchequer,' under date Michaelmas, 14 Edward III. (A.D. 1320), appears the following entry relating to the binding of the smaller book: 'To William, the bookbinder, of London, for binding and newly repairing the Book of Domesday, in which is contained the counties of Essex, Norfolk, and Suffolk, and for his stipend, costs, and labour; received the money the 5th day of December, by his own hands—3*s.* 4*d.*' Possibly this entry refers to the wooden cover of the smaller volume, which was, as already stated, removed at the Chapter House.

The *+Domesday+* Chest.

Nothing is known with precision as to the date of this curious specimen of early iron work. In Sir Francis Palgrave's Introduction to the 'Kalendars and Inventories of the Exchequer' (Vol. i. p. 118), a 'large chest' is described which

bears a strong resemblance to this particular coffer. The passage runs: '16 January, 2 Henry VI., the Treasury received a case containing the Ampulla of consecrated oil with which the King is anointed on the day of his coronation, two pairs of bracelets, and a sceptre. And on the last day of February, 5 Henry VI., the Ampulla and the "Rod of Aaron," as the sceptre appears to have been designated, were taken out of their cases by the Duke of Bedford, in presence of the Lords of the Council assembled in the Star Chamber, and placed in a coffer of leather, bound with iron, secured by three locks, and sealed with the Duke's signet; which coffer itself was placed *in a large chest in the Great Treasury at Westminster, also locked with three locks.* At the same time the great crown, then lately in the custody of the Bishop of Winchester, and previously deposited in the same coffer, was delivered by the Duke of Bedford and others of the King's Council, to Walter Hungerford, the Treasurer, and Chamberlains of the Exchequer.'

The external measurements are: length, 3 ft. 2½ in.; breadth, 2 ft. 1 in.; height, 2 ft. 3 in. The massive lid is 3 ft. 7½ in. by 2 ft. 3 in. The chest was formerly secured by three locks, and a small compartment in the interior has an additional lock. This chest was brought from the Chapter House with Domesday Book.

The +Abbreviatio+ of Domesday Book.

In the Introduction to the '*Antient Kalendars and Inventories of the Exchequer*,' Sir Francis Palgrave gives the following description of this manuscript: 'Besides the original "Domesday," the Treasury possesses an abridgment forming a very beautiful volume, apparently compiled early in the reign of Edward I. The handwriting is a fine specimen of

caligraphy ; the capitals are illuminated ; in the margins of some of the pages are circles of gold, containing heads or half-lengths, representing the chief tenants whose lands are therein described. Prefixed are leaves of vellum, with six illuminations or pictures of incidents from the legend of Edward the Confessor. These are in a rude and singular style of art, possibly not later than the reign of Henry I. Peter le Neve has written a note on the fly-leaf, in which he states his belief that the volume was illuminated and transcribed in the reign of Henry VII. ; a most singular error to have been committed by an antiquary of so much experience.' Le Neve's note runs :

'Memorandum quod ego Petrus le Neve, *Norroy*, et unus vice-camerariorum Scaccarii Domine Anne, Magne Britannie, &c., Regine, &c., suppono hunc librum scriptum fuisse in tempore regni Regis Henrici septimi, quia illuminationes adeo nitidæ, et exemplificatio ultime voluntatis Henrici septimi Regis Angliæ eadem quasi manu exarata est—Quære tamen.

' P. LE NEVE, *Norroy*.

'Vide etiam Guischardini descriptionem Belgie sub titulo Civitatis Bruges de illuminatoribus in Angliam transportatis.'

The six illuminations refer to the following incidents in the life of Edward the Confessor :

1. Edward the Confessor charges Earl Godwin with causing the death of Alfred, the king's brother (*see* 'Lives of Edward the Confessor,' Rolls Series, p. 271).
2. The Earl offers to prove his innocence by eating a morsel of bread blessed by the king (*ib.* p. 272).
3. The Vision of the King of the Danes, drowned whilst passing from a boat on board a ship (*ib.* p. 215).
4. The Vision of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus, turning from their right to their left sides (portending war, famine, and pestilence) (*ib.* p. 273).
5. The Miracle of the Eucharist (*ib.* p. 250).

6. The Legend of the Ring given by Edward the Confessor to St. John the Evangelist (*ib.* p. 276).

In the manuscript, marginal references are given to the pages of the 'Decem Scriptores,' where some of the incidents depicted are alluded to.

The 'Abbreviatio' was prepared for the use of the Chamberlains of the Exchequer. It has never been printed.

The +Breviate+ of Domesday Book.

This manuscript, which appears to be of the thirteenth century, belongs to the Queen's Remembrancer's Department of the Exchequer. It was compiled for the use of the Treasurer. In this abstract of 'Domesday' the 'villani,' 'bordarii,' and stock are omitted. The volume contains, in addition, curious verses and memoranda; among these are some of the prophecies of Merlin.

The 'Breviate' has never been printed.

The Boldon Book.

This celebrated survey of the Palatinate of Durham was made in the year 1183, by order of Bishop Hugh Pudsey, kinsman to King Stephen. It probably took its name from Boldon, a township and parish near Sunderland. The original of the Boldon Book is not known to be extant. Three copies of it, however, remain: 1. One preserved among the Auditor's Records, Durham. 2. One in the Library of the Dean and Chapter of Durham. 3. One among the MSS. of Archbishop Laud at Oxford.

The first MS. here mentioned was transferred to the Public Record Office with the other records of the Palatinate in 1869. It is a manuscript of the fourteenth century, on

parchment, entitled on the cover, 'Supervisus tempore Thome Hatfeld, Episcopi.' At leaf 103 commences the copy of Bishop Pudsey's Survey. This was the manuscript used by the Rev. Mr. Greenwell as the text of his edition of the 'Boldon Buke' published for the Surtees Society.

The 'Boldon Book' is also printed in Vol. IV. pp. 565-587 of the Record Commission Edition of Domesday. (See BIBLIOGRAPHY, *sub* Durham.)

The Red Book of the Exchequer.

After Domesday Book this is the most famous record of the Exchequer. Its compilation was commenced early in the reign of Henry III. Among the principal contents are :

1. The 'Dialogus de Scaccario,' or treatise on the ancient constitution and practice of the Exchequer, in which it is stated (Book I., chap. xv.) that 'Domesday' was always kept with the Great Seal at the Exchequer—'Porro liber de quo quæris sigilli Regii comes est individuus in Thesauro.' This further description of 'Domesday' is also given in chapter xvi. of the 'Dialogue':—

Cum insignis ille subactor Angliæ Rex Willelmus, ejusdem Pontificus sanguine propinquus, ultiores Insulæ fines suo subjugasset imperio, et rebellium mentes terribilium perdomuisset exemplis ; ne libera de cætero daretur erroris facultas, decrevit subjectum sibi populum juri scripto legibusque subicere. Propositis igitur legibus Anglicanis secundum tripartitam earum distinctionem, hoc est Merchenelage, Denelaga, Westsaxenelage, quasdam reprobavit, quasdam autem approbans, illis transmarinas Neustriæ leges, quæ ad Regni pacem tuendam efficacissimæ videbantur, adjecit. Demum ne quid deesse videretur ad omnem totius providentiæ summam, communicato consilio, discretissimos a latere suo destinavit viros per Regnum in circuitu. Ab hiis itaque totius terræ descriptio diligens facta est, tam in nemoribus, quam in pascuis et pratis, nec non et

agriculturis, et verbis communibus annotata *in librum redacta est*; ut videlicet quilibet, jure suo contentus, alienum non usurpet impune. Fit autem descriptio per Comitatus, per Centuriatas, et per Hidas, prænotato in ipso capite Regis nomine, ac deinde seriatim aliorum procerum nominibus apposis secundum status sui dignitatem, qui videlicet de Rege tenent in capite. Apponuntur autem singulis numeri secundum ordinem sic dispositis, per quos inferius in ipsa libri serie, quæ ad eos pertinent, facilius occurrunt. Hic liber ab indigenis *Domesdei* nuncupatur, id est, dies judicii per Metaphoram; sicut enim districti et terribilis examinis illius novissimi sententia nulla tergiversationis arte valet eludi: sic cum orta fuerit in regno contentio de his rebus quæ illic annotantur, cum ventum fuerit ad Librum, sententia ejus infatuari non potest vel impune declinari. Ob hoc nos eundem *Librum Judicarium* nominavimus; non quod in eo de propositis aliquis dubiis feratur sententia; sed quod ab eo sicut a prædicto judicio non licet ulla ratione discedere.

The 'Dialogue' then proceeds to explain the nature of the hide, the hundred, and the county '*secundum vulgarem opinionem.*'

2. Copies of the 'Cartæ' of the tenants-in-chief returned into the Exchequer A.D. 1166, certifying what knights' fees they held and were held of them. Two only of the original 'Cartæ'—out of more than two hundred and fifty sent into the Treasury—are known to be extant.

3. The inquisitions returned into the Treasury of the Exchequer in the 12th and 13th years of King John as to the holders of knights' fees and their services.

4. A collection of Serjeanties in different counties.

5. The 'Constitutio Domus Regis,' or Book of the Household of Henry II.

6. A large collection (made by Alexander de Swereford, an officer of the Exchequer), from the Pipe Rolls, of scutages levied between 2 Henry II. and 13 John, compiled in order to ascertain the knights' fees granted, so as to serve as a guide in future levies

7. An abstract of the lost Pipe Roll of the first year of Henry II.

8. Documents and memoranda relating to the Exchequer.

9. Diplomas, charters, royal letters, papal bulls, and treaties.

An edition of the Red Book is in progress for the series of 'Chronicles and Memorials' (Record Publications).

The Black Book of the Exchequer

(Liber Niger Scaccarii).

This was part of the original stock or library of the Treasury, and so termed from the colour of its binding. The contents include: (1) A perpetual Kalendar for finding the Dominical Letters, &c., from the year 1184 (about which time it was made) to the year 1688. (2) An Almanac for the twelve months of the year, with coeval notices of remarkable occurrences. The earliest of these passages relate to the battles of Lewes (14 May A.D. 1264) and of Evesham (4 Aug. A.D. 1265), and the latest incident is the battle of Braxton Moor [Flodden Field] (9 Sept. 1513). (3) Drawings in outline, representing the Eagle, the emblem of St. John; the Bull, the emblem of St. Luke; an Angel, the emblem of St. Matthew; and a winged Lion, the emblem of St. Mark, accompanied by verses from the Gospels. These representations may have been used for the purpose of administering an oath as upon the Gospels. (4) Drawings in outline of the Crucifixion, the Virgin and Child, St. Michael, &c. (5) The tract known as the 'Dialogus de Scaccario,' according to tradition in the original autograph of Gervase of Tilbury. (6) Oaths of various officers of the Exchequer. (7) Memoranda as to admissions of Chamberlains, Tellers and Clerks of

the Pells, extending from 19 Edward II. to 1715. Some original instruments are also inserted or annexed to the leaves.

The second part of this '*Liber Niger*' is a modern volume, containing appointments of Treasurers and Chamberlains and other officers, orders of Court concerning tallies, and other notices relating to the Receipt of the Treasury.

The only portion of the '*Liber Niger*' which has been printed is the 'Dialogus.'

The Smaller Black Book of the Exchequer

(*Liber Niger Parvus Scaccarii*).

The second '*Liber Niger*,' appertaining to the King's Remembrancer of the Exchequer, sometimes called '*Liber Niger Parvus*,' contains, among other matter, the '*Constitutio Domus Regis*,' or an account of the royal household in the reign of Henry II.; the last Will of Henry II.; two conventions between Henry I. and Robert, Count of Flanders; conventions between Henry II. and Philip, Count of Flanders; another between Stephen and Henry, son of the Empress Maud; bulls of Pope Alexander III.; and copies of the charters of the King's tenants *in capite*, certifying the knights' fees held by them or holden of them in the year 1166.

Hearne published two editions of this book, but from imperfect transcripts.

The Pipe Rolls.

This fine series of Exchequer Rolls dates from a period about forty-five years earlier than any of the Chancery enrolments. Madox in his '*History of the Exchequer*,' refers

to these Rolls as 'Recorda, omnium quæ in archivis Regis usquam vidisse me memini splendidissima; post Rotulum quem *Librum Domesday* vocant; quin ei æquiparanda.' They contain the accounts of the King's revenue, year by year, as they were made up with the King's officers appointed to that service by the Sheriffs of the counties, who acted as the King's bailiffs, and by other ministers and debtors of the Crown.

The earliest Roll extant has been assigned by Hunter, who edited the manuscript for the Record Commission, to the thirty-first year of Henry I. (A.D. 1130-1). Between the date of 'Domesday' and this Great Roll of the Exchequer there is a chasm in the Public Records. The next Roll of the series is that of the second year of Henry II. (A.D. 1155-6), but from that early date the series is nearly perfect. A Roll of the fourteenth year of King Charles II. shows how these enrolments are increased in bulk in the seventeenth century as compared with those of the twelfth century.

The Pipe Rolls of 31 Henry I.; 2, 3, and 4 Henry II.; 1 Richard I.; and 3 John (the Chancellor's Antigraph) were printed by the Record Commission. All the rolls prior to A.D. 1200 are now in course of publication by the Pipe Roll Society.

Tallies of the Exchequer.

The tallies in use at the Exchequer were narrow shafts of box, willow, or other hard wood, on which notches were cut to denote particular sums of money; and by this primitive method the amounts paid into the Exchequer were duly checked. On the obverse surface of the shaft the principal numeral of the sum was cut in one bold notch. Then, on the reverse surface, were cut the subsidiary numerals of the sum required to be inscribed, with a suitable interval between each

denomination. Thus, £1,000 was cut in one deep notch of the width of a man's palm ; for £100 the notch was no wider than a thumb-mark ; £20 was cut as broad as the little finger ; and the £1 notch was only deep enough to contain a barleycorn ; These shafts, so scored, were subsequently split longitudinally, one half being handed to the King's debtor and the other half, or counterfoil, retained at the Exchequer. On the accountant's half being brought into the Exchequer for payment, the foil and counter-foil were first joined to test their agreement, and, if they tallied, the money was allowed. In the twelfth century nine inches seems to have been the usual length of a tally, but those of the present century are not unlike the wooden swords of the South Sea Islanders. In attempting to get rid of the tallies by burning them, the flues of the Houses of Parliament became overheated, and the two Houses were thus burnt down on the 16th of October, 1834.

Among the tallies selected for exhibition are some belonging to the reign of Henry III., which relate to the manor of Ledcombe, in Berkshire ; they are the earliest and smallest specimens preserved in the Public Record Office. Some Court Rolls of this manor, of the same reign, are stated by Sir Francis Palgrave (' *Antient Kalendars and Inventories of the Exchequer*, I. p. lxvi) to be, in his belief, amongst the earliest rolls of this class of record now extant.

Cartae Antiquae.

These consist of transcripts, made during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, of charters granted by various Sovereigns, from Æthilberht, King of Kent, to the reign of Edward I. The earliest document entered on these rolls (Roll I. No. 18) is King Æthilberht's grant to St. Augustine's Monastery at Canterbury of the vill called Sturigao, otherwise Cistelet ;

also a silver dish, a golden 'scapton,' a saddle with a bridle ornamented with gold and gems, a silver mirror, silken dalmatics, and an embroidered cloak, the gift of Pope Gregory. The date of this charter is given by Kemble as 9th January, 605. This transcript is followed by King Cnut's grant to the same monastery of the body of S. Mildred the Virgin, with all the land both within and without the island of Thanet belonging to the same church. The first document on Roll CC. purports to be the foundation-charter of St. Peter's Monastery at Westminster, granted by King Edward the Confessor in 1066. The proem states :—

'That the King, considering his peaceful accession to the throne of this kingdom, after so many bitter wars in former reigns, had resolved to perform a pilgrimage to the temple of the apostles Saints Peter and Paul, and there to render thanks for benefits bestowed, and to pray that God would continue that peace to him and his successors for ever. He therefore reckoned up the expenses necessary for the journey, and the honourable gifts which he should make to the Holy Apostles, but great anxiety befell the King's nobles lest during his absence the kingdom should be again disturbed by any hostility and lest any mischance or sickness should happen to him by the way, especially because he had no son. They, therefore, after due deliberation, besought him to desist from this purpose, promising that they would themselves make satisfaction for his vow to God in masses and prayers and a plentiful distribution of alms. But the King opposed this with all his might, and at length it was decided that two legates on behalf of either party, Bishops Ealdred and Hereman, and Abbots Wulfric and Ælfwin, should be sent to declare to the Pope the King's desire, and also the desire of the others, and the King promised to abide by his sentence in all things. The legates therefore proceeded to Rome and found a synod assembled in the city. When they had explained the King's desire before two hundred and fifty bishops and a multitude of holy fathers, the Pope then, on the advice of the synod, wrote a letter to the King absolving him from his vow, and enjoining him to distribute to the poor the expenses which he had set apart for his journey, and either to construct anew, to the honour of S. Peter prince of the Apostles,

a monastery, or to repair and enlarge the old one, and to provide its inmates with sufficient sustenance. These and other commands the legates related to the King, and in the meantime the blessed S. Peter revealed to a certain monk of an honest life, by name Wlfsin, his wish that the King should restore the place called Westminster founded in the time of S. Augustine, the first bishop in England, and enriched by the munificence of the Kings of old, but which now from age and from wars seems almost destroyed. And when this vision was related to the King, and he received similar precepts from the apostolical letter, he applied himself to the rebuilding of that place. He, therefore, ordered to be tithed all his substance as well in gold and silver as in flocks, and all kinds of possessions; and destroying the old building, he constructed an entirely new church and caused it to be dedicated on the fifth kalends of January, on which day he placed there the relics which Pope Martin and Leo who consecrated him gave to King Ælfred, and which he besought Carloman, King of the French, should be given him, whose daughter, his father, King Æthelwlf, married after the death of his first wife, and which from him came to his successor Æthelstan, then to Eadgar, and last to King Eadward; namely, two pieces of the cross of our Lord, a piece of a nail, a piece of his garment without seam, and a piece of the garments of S. Mary, and relics of the apostles Peter and Paul, Andrew, Bartholomew, Barnabas, and of many other saints, and five coffers full of other relics of saints; and he also granted right of sanctuary for every fugitive. The King also renewed and confirmed the privileges which his grandfather Eadgar, and his uncle the glorious King and Martyr Eadward son of Eadgar, and Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury, and King Æthelred his father gave to that place; he also ordained that it should be free from all secular service, and that the election of abbots should be according to the rule of S. Benedict. Neither the abbot nor any other person to have liberty to sell or to give to strangers any of the possessions of the monastery. The King also granted and confirmed the gifts made by his predecessors,' &c. &c. [*Appendix to the 29th Report of the Deputy-Keeper of the Public Records, p. 24.*]

The following extract from the same King's grant to the abbey of Waltham Holy Cross, in Essex, in A.D. 1062 (Roll M., No. 1), may be given as an illustration of the

precise manner in which boundaries were defined in these early charters :—

‘These are the land boundaries to Passefelde. That is, first from the old hatch at Freotherne felde to Presta hlype ; to the brook at Staundune ; and from Staundune to Scealdeforda, and from Sceldeforda to Coleboge well ; from the well again to the old hatch, and so again to Freothene field.

‘These are the land boundaries to Welde. First from Dellen north to the mouth, east to Hafegeæte ; from Hafegeæte east to the wolf-pit ; from the pit south to the Purk, from the Purk south to Freobearne’s leap, and so to Manne’s land, and thence again to Dellen.

‘These are the land boundaries to Upmynstre. First at Tigelhyrste south to the boundary ditch ; from the ditch west to Ingceburne, and from the bourne north to Beccengare ; and from Beccengare north along the road-weald to Stangare ; from Stangare north into Mannes land ; from Mannes land again to Tigelhyrste.

‘These are the land boundaries to Walhfare. First from the ash to the old leap ; from the leap to the old wood hatch ; from the hatch to the old road ; and from the road to Sandæcre ; and from the acre to Beadewan river ; from the river to Winebrook ; from the brook north again to the ash.

‘These are the land boundaries to Tippedene. First to Tippaburne ; from the bourne up to the heath ; from the heath to Thetden’s boundary opposite Æffa’s hatch, and so to the river ; along the river, then again to Tippeburne.

‘These are the land boundaries to Æwartone. First at Werdhæcce ; from Wardhæcce to Eacroft ; from Eacroft to Beolleepool ; from the pool to Leofsige’s meadows ; from Leofsige’s meadow to Omermad ; from Omermad to Ætheric’s leap ; from the leap to Wulf leap ; from Wulf leap to Thesfalde ; from Thesfalde to Stanway hatch ; from Stanway hatch to Sateres byrig.

‘These are the land boundaries to Wudeford. First to Angric’s bourne to Alderman’s hatch ; to the King’s hatch ; from the King’s hatch again to Angric’s bourne.

‘These are the land boundaries to Lambe hythe. First at Brixges stane, and so on through the grove to the boundary dyke, and so to Bulke tree ; and from Bulke tree to Hyse ; and from Hyse to Ælsyge’s hatch ; and so east to the road ; and so along the road again to Brixes stan.

‘These are the land boundaries to Nassingan. That is from Cerlen hatch, along the mark to Scelden boundary; and from Scelden boundary to the brook; and from the brook to Butterwyelle; and from Buterwelle to Thurolde’s boundary; and from Thurolde’s boundary again along the mark to Cerlen hatch; and the meadow thereto belonging lies out by the Lea.’—[*Appendix to the 29th Report of the Deputy-Keeper of the Public Records*, pp. 30-31.]

Pope Nicholas’s Taxation.

In the year 1288, Pope Nicholas IV. granted the tenths of all ecclesiastical benefices to King Edward I., for six years, towards paying the expenses of an expedition to the Holy Land; and, that they might be collected to the full extent, a taxation by the King’s precept was begun in that year and finished, as to the province of Canterbury, in 1291, and as to that of York, in the following year. This taxation, called ‘*Taxatio Ecclesiastica*,’ regulated the taxes of the clergy as well to our kings as to the popes, until the survey of 26 Henry VIII., called ‘*Valor Ecclesiasticus* s.’

This record has been printed.

Testa de MeBiff.

These volumes contain an account of fees holden either immediately of the King or of others *in capite*; of fees holden in frankalmoigne, and the values thereof; of serjeanties holden of the King; of widows and heiresses of tenants *in capite*, whose marriages were in the gift of the King, and the values of their lands; of churches in the gift of the King, and in whose hands; of escheats, as well of the Normans as of others, in whose hands they were and by what services they were held; and of the amount paid for scutage and aid by each

tenant. The chief use of the work is to ascertain the principal landholders throughout the kingdom in the reigns of Henry III. and Edward I.

Sir Thomas Hardy, in his 'Descriptive Catalogue'—a work of extraordinary research—gives the following note:—
'The origin of the title of this record is a matter of doubt. Dugdale suggests that it was named after Jollan de Neville, one of the itinerant justices at that time; but in all probability it was called after Ralph de Nevill, a collector of aids in the reign of Henry III. It has also been suggested, though with more conceit than probability, that "Testa de Nevill was a jocular appellation equivalent to *Nevill's headpiece*—Testa meaning the skull, and being the origin of the French *teste* or *tête*—and was bestowed on the document, as supplying information possessed by some experienced officer of the Exchequer, who may have written it as a remembrance to serve his successors in office; or it may have been completed after the death of such a person, to serve the place of his *skull*, which in his lifetime had contained the knowledge of the documents from which it had been made up."

This record has been printed by the Record Commission.

Kirby's Quest.

In 35 Edward I. (A.D. 1306-7), Adam Kirkeby or Kirby, then Treasurer, and his fellows, made inquiry, according to the ancient custom, by inquests or verdicts of juries, concerning the tenures *in capite* throughout several of the shires of England, and the result of these verdicts or inquests was a volume which, in some respects, is analogous to 'Domesday,' inasmuch as it comprehends all the immediate military tenants of the crown. Only a fragment of the original is

now extant, preserved among the 'Subsidy Rolls' ($\frac{240}{251}$), containing portions of the counties of York, Devon, Dorset, Salop, Kent, Oxon, and Lincoln. The remaining portions of Kirby's Quest are preserved to us in a sixteenth-century transcript—a volume belonging to the Queen's Remembrancer's side of the Exchequer. There are two volumes among the Chapter House Books (B_{11} and $B_{\frac{4}{24}}$), which contain portions of 'Kirby's Quest.'

The Book of Aids.

This volume contains the details of the assessment of the Aid ('rationabile auxilium') granted in the 20th year of King Edward III. for knighting the Black Prince. The returns include the following counties: Bedford, Bucks, Cambridge, Cumberland, Devon, Cornwall, York (East and West Ridings), Essex, Hertford (under Essex), Gloucester, Hereford, Kent, Lancaster, Lincoln ('in partibus de Holand'), Middlesex, Nottingham, Derby, Norfolk, Suffolk, Northumberland, Salop, Stafford, Somerset, Dorset, Southampton, Worcester. Returns of the Aid for the marriage of Blanche, the King's daughter, in the counties of Oxford, Berks, Wilts, and Stafford are also included in this MS.

Portions of this book have been printed in the Transactions of various Archæological Societies.

Registrum Munimentorum.

The very valuable and important registers so entitled are designated in the Memoranda as the two books bound in wood and covered with red leather (the present bindings are

modern), and called the Books of Remembrances, otherwise the Registers. They formed part of the Treasury Library. From the handwriting and the contents they appear to have been framed in the earlier part of the reign of Edward I. They were intended as the commencement of a regular and continuous register of public documents, but principally of those relating to foreign affairs and to the transactions of the dependencies of the English Crown. The two folio volumes are now distinguished as 'Liber A' and 'Liber B.' The Will of Edward I., made at Acres, will be found at p. 308 of Vol. A. Some of the marginal drawings are curious.

Portions of Vols. A. and B. are printed in Rymer's 'Fœdera.'

Valor Ecclesiasticus.

The 'Valor Ecclesiasticus' or 'Liber Regis' was formed to give effect to the Statute 26 Henry VIII. cap. 3, which gave the first-fruits and tenths of ecclesiastical benefices to the King. To carry out the new assessment and valuation of ecclesiastical property, a survey was appointed to be made by Commissioners to be sent to every part of the kingdom. The commission is dated 30th January, 26 Henry VIII. (1535). Part of the original records are lost. Some of the returns were made in the form of books, some on rolls of paper and on parchment. Fortunately there is a book preserved, being a compilation made from these records for the use of the office of First-Fruits when the record was entire. In this book are entered the names of the dignities and benefices, with the value of each, but without the particulars. From this MS., called the 'Liber Valorum,' the deficiencies were supplied in printing the 'Valor Ecclesiasticus,' viz. the whole diocese of Ely, a great part of the diocese of London, the

counties of Berks, Rutland, and Northumberland, much of the diocese of York, including the whole deaneries of Rydal and Craven. This assessment or survey superseded that known under the name of the Taxation of Pope Nicholas (temp. Edw. I.), which, however, is still of use in the interpretation of the statutes of some colleges founded before the Reformation, which are exempted from the restriction in Statute 21 Henry VIII. concerning pluralities. The 'Valor' contains surveys of archbishoprics, bishoprics, abbeys, monasteries, priories, colleges, hospitals, archdeaconries, deaneries, provostships, prebends, parsonages, vicarages, chantries, free-chapels, or other dignities, benefices, offices, or promotions spiritual.

This has been printed by the Record Commission in six volumes.

Registers + Chartularies + Leidger + and Cowcher Books.

These volumes, mostly monastic, contain transcripts of the charters by which lands and hereditaments were granted to the various religious houses. Many important surveys are also set out in the pages of these manuscripts. The following are selected from those now preserved among the Public Records :

The great Cowchers or Cartæ Regum of the Duchy of Lancaster.

The White Book of the Duchy of Cornwall.

Chartulary of the Monastery of Chertsey.

Chartulary of Oseney Priory.

Chartulary of the Monastery of St. Augustine at Canterbury.

Cowcher of the Abbey of Selby.
Cowcher of the Monastery of Furness.
Cowcher of the Honor of Tutbury.
Custumals of Battle Abbey
Chartulary of Ramsey Abbey.
Cowcher of Kirkstall Abbey.
Register of St. Edmond's Bury.
Register of St. Nicholas Burscogh.
Chartulary of Malmesbury Abbey.
Chartulary of Torre Abbey.
Chartulary of the Monastery of Godstowe.
Chartulary of the College of Warwick.
Chartulary of the Monastery of Langdon.
Register of Lands of the Templars.
Chartulary of the Monastery of Newstead.
The Vetus Codex.
Register of Richard de Kellawe, Bishop of Durham.

As a specimen of the contents of these volumes, the following abstract of King Eadgar's charter, granted to the Abbey of Ramsey (*Chartulary*, f. 136), and dated 28th December, A.D. 974, may be quoted :—

'The King notifies that a certain man very dear to him, and very nearly related to him, by name Aylwyn the Alderman, with his assent and licence, constructed in the island called by the inhabitants Rameseya, in honour of the Blessed Virgin Mary and S. Benedict, a monastery for holy virgins, and foreseeing the uncertainty of future times, he determines to make known to posterity how a miracle was performed there, as related by certain bishops and by Aylwin himself, thus :

'The aforesaid illustrious man Aylwin having been afflicted many years with gout in the feet, it happened one night that a certain fisherman of his named Wlfget went to the water called Rammesmere with his boat and attendants and line to catch fish for his master according to his usual custom. But although he cast his net about endeavouring to catch something, it was the will of God that his labour should be in vain, and at length being overcome by fatigue,

he fell asleep in his boat ; and in his sleep the holy S. Benedict appeared unto him, saying thus : “ When Aurora scatters her beams over the heavens, then cast thy net, and thou shalt meet with as great a multitude of fishes as thou wishest ; and the larger one of them which ye call Haked offer thou to thy master Aylwin on my behalf, saying, that on receiving my gift he should without delay apply himself to the building for the Holy Mother of Mercy, and for myself, and for all holy virgins in this island, a fitting monastery, with necessary offices ; and I beseech thee to make known to him all these things in order, adding speech to speech that he may diligently observe in what manner his animals there, when weary, lie down upon the earth by night, and wherever he shall see the bull on arising from sleep strike the ground with his right foot, that he should know without doubt that he ought to erect on that spot the altar of a monastery. And that he may the more readily and surely give credence to my commands, this thy little finger, which I now bend, he, immediately he is freed from his gout, shall restore for thee.’

‘ Then the same master of the fisherman waking early, and seeing a streak of daylight in the east, began to loose his net, as he was ordered ; and, as the holy father had told him, he drew in a great multitude of fishes, and, choosing the larger one of them on behalf of S. Benedict, offered it to his master, and related to him all that he had learned in his vision, and besought him that he would use his utmost to straighten his finger, which was bent by the saint. Aylwin, understanding all these things, straightened the man’s lame finger, and, taking the fish, gave innumerable thanks with blessing to the Mother of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to S. Benedict, and arising with haste, ordered his horse to be prepared, and, travelling to the island, went to see, as he was ordered, how his animals were lying. Wonderful ! and to be wondered at ! immediately he entered the island he was at God’s command freed entirely from his intractable disease, and saw his animals lying in the form of the cross, and the bull in the midst of them. And as once upon a time a lamb with his right foot revealed to S. Clement the place of a fountain, so the bull striking the ground with his foot revealed, in a divine manner to this man, the place of the altar of the future monastery. Whereupon Aylwin, praising God, immediately ordered that a chapel should be built there of wooden logs, in fine work, and then, as he was ordered,

constructed in a becoming form a monastery for a future congregation of regular monks. Then, after the lapse of five years and eighteen days, on the petition of Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Oswald, Archbishop of York, the King on the sixth ides of November, A.D. 974, second indiction, caused the same church to be dedicated with becoming solemnity in honour of the Blessed Virgin Mary and of the saints aforesaid. The same year also at Christmastide the King confirmed all gifts of lands or possessions made by the said Aylwin, or any other persons to the said church for ever.' [*Appendix to the 29th Report of the Deputy-Keeper of the Public Records*, p. 18.]

Domesday Commemoration

1886

NOTES ON THE MANUSCRIPTS AND PRINTED BOOKS
EXHIBITED AT THE BRITISH MUSEUM

Manuscripts Exhibited in the British Museum.

Harley MS. 3271.

1. **Statement** of the numbers of hides in the different divisions of England south of the Humber, written in Anglo-Saxon about A.D. 1000, on a single page in a MS. containing Ælfric's Grammar and other tracts. Printed by W. de G. Birch, in the *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 1884.

Cotton MS. Vitellius C. viii.

2. **Domesday Survey**: Abridgment for the county of Kent, written early in the 12th century. Originally in the form of a roll, but now cut into sections and inlaid in a volume containing historical and other tracts.

Cotton MS. Tiberius A. vi.

3. **Inquisitio Cantabrigiensis**: Domesday Survey of the County of Cambridge in the original form as returned by the Jurors, together with the Survey of the monastic land of the Abbey of Ely. A transcript made at the end of the 12th century. Copy of early charters relating to Ely are added. Bound up with a copy of the Saxon Chronicle brought down to the year 977, and with other tracts. See *Inquisitio Comitatus Cantabrigiensis—subjicitur Inquisitio Eliensis*, curâ N.E. S.A. Hamilton, London, 1876.

Arundel MS. 153.

4. **Domesday Survey**: Abridgment omitting several of the counties. Written about the year 1200. Formerly belonged to the Abbey of Margan, co. Glamorgan.

Cotton MS. Tiberius A. xiii.

5. **Chartulary of the Abbey of Worcester**, compiled by a monk of the house, named Heming, by order of Bishop Wulfstan [A.D. 1062-1095]; to which are appended, in a hand of the 12th century, a list of lands of which the Abbey had been unjustly deprived, and 'Indiculum Libertatis de Oswaldes Lawes Hundred que a toto vicecomitatu Wireceastre sacramento iurisiurandi firmata est, Willelmo seniore regnante,' being the Domesday Survey of the monastic lands in that hundred. The MS. was injured in the fire of 1731. Edited by Thomas Hearne, Oxford, 1723.

Cotton MS. Claudius C. v.

6. **Lincolnshire Survey**, made in the reign of Henry the First, apparently between the years 1101 and 1109. Originally in the form of a roll, but now cut into sections and bound as a volume. See the autotype reproduction: *The Lincolnshire Survey, temp. Henry I.* edited by J. Greenstreet, London, 1884.

Stowe MS. 510.

7. **The Boldon Book**: Register of the Cathedral Priory of Durham, including, in addition to Charters and copies of the Statutes, the 'Boldon Book,' or survey of the see of Durham, made by order of Bishop Hugh Pudsey in 1183, papal and other letters, rentals, valuations of churches, pleas at Durham, in 1305, etc. Written in various hands of the 13th-15th centuries. The 'Boldon Book' was published

from other and later copies by the Record Commission, as an Appendix to 'Domesday,' in 1816, and by the Surtees Society, ed. W. Greenwell, in 1852.

Additional MS. 15350.

8. **Chartulary of the Priory of St. Swithun, Winchester,** containing a large collection of royal and other charters in Anglo-Saxon and Latin, with details of the boundaries of the lands in Anglo-Saxon, from the reign of Ceadwalla of Wessex, A.D. 688, to that of Edward the Confessor, A.D. 1046, with the addition of a few others of later date, granted by William I., Henry I., and Stephen. Compiled, probably, in the time of Henry of Blois, Bishop of Winchester, between the years 1130 and 1150. In ancient binding.

Cotton MS. *Vespasian B.* xxiv.

9. **Chartulary of the Abbey of Evesham,** compiled in the latter part of the 12th century, and embodying Domesday memoranda relating to the counties of Worcester and Gloucester.

Cotton MS. *Faustina A.* iii.

10. **Chartulary of the Abbey of St. Peter of Westminster,** including transcripts of early English charters. Compiled late in the 13th century.

Harley MS. 436.

11. **Chartulary of the Abbey of Wilton,** containing copies of early charters, with the details of the boundaries of lands in Anglo-Saxon. Compiled in the latter part of the 12th century.

Cotton MS. *Claudius C.* ix.

12. **Chartulary of the Abbey of Abingdon,** compiled in the 12th century. The measurements of lands expressed in

the titles at ff. 113, 114 as hides, are represented in the text of the deeds as *cassati*, or *mansæ*, the three terms being used as equivalent.

Cotton MS. Claudius B. vi.

13. **Chronicle of the Abbey of Abingdon**, embodying copies of charters in which details of the boundaries of the lands are expressed in Anglo-Saxon. Compiled about A.D. 1200. Edited by Rev. J. Stevenson (Rolls Series), 1858.

Additional MS. 14847.

14. **Registrum Album**: a chartulary of the Abbey of Bury St. Edmunds, containing copies of early charters, wills, etc., in Latin and Anglo-Saxon. Compiled late in the 13th century. Written in an archaic style of writing.

Royal MS. 6 C. xi.

15. **Letter of William de Poterna to R[obert ?] Prior of Bath**, sending him an extract from the 'liber de domesdai' relating to Bath; [*circa*. A.D. 1198 ?]. Transcribed on a fly-leaf.

Exeter, Chapter Library, No. 3500.

16. **Exon Domesday**: the survey for the counties of Wilts, Dorset, Somerset, Devon, and Cornwall, being apparently an exact transcript of the original returns from which the Exchequer Domesday was compiled. As compared with the latter it gives fuller details, as *e.g.* in the enumeration of live stock; it has variations of diction and in the spelling of names; and the tenants of the time of Edward the Confessor are more generally noticed. Written in various hands at the close of the 11th century; the book contains 258 leaves, being made up of distinct sections or quires, written independently by the several scribes, and probably at, or soon after, the date

of the Survey. Printed in the Record Commission edition of Domesday, 1816, vol. iv., p. 1.

Lent by the Dean and Chapter of Exeter.

Cambridge, Trinity College Library, O. 2, 41.

17. **Inquisitio Eliensis**: Domesday Survey of the monastic lands of the Abbey of Ely, in the counties of Cambridge, Norfolk, Suffolk, Hertford, Huntingdon and Essex. A transcript made in the latter part of the 12th century. The MS. also contains the History of the Abbey, with charters. See description of Cotton MS. Tiberius A. vi. Printed in the Record Commission edition of Domesday, 1816, vol. iv., p. 497.

Lent by the Master and Fellows of Trinity College, Cambridge.

Cambridge, Trinity College Library, O. 2, 1.

18. **Inquisitio Eliensis**: Domesday Survey of the monastic lands of the Abbey of Ely. A transcript made at the end of the 12th century. The MS. also contains the 'Historia Eliensis Insule,' or History of the Abbey, with charters and a list of lands of which the abbey had been unjustly deprived. See description of MS. O. 2, 41.

Lent by the Master and Fellows of Trinity College, Cambridge.

Canterbury, Chapter Library, MS. E. 28.

19. **Domesday Monachorum**: a collection of muniments, customs, etc., of Christ Church, Canterbury, including particulars of holdings in Kent, copied from the Domesday Survey. Written in the 12th century.

Lent by the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury.

Society of Antiquaries, MS. 154.

20. **Winton Domesday**: being two separate surveys, the first taken between 1107 and 1128, by order of Henry the

First, to ascertain what King Edward the Confessor held in Winchester, as of his own demesne; the second, a general survey of lands in Winchester, taken at the command of Bishop Henry of Blois, in 1148. A transcript of the 12th century. In ancient binding. Printed in the Record Commission edition of Domesday, 1816, vol. iv. p. 531.

Lent by the Society of Antiquaries.

St. Paul's Cathedral Library, Liber L.

21. **Domesday of St. Paul's**: being the register of the inquisition of the Manors belonging to the Cathedral Church of St. Paul of London, taken by Ralph de Diceto, Dean, in 1181. A transcript of the 13th century, bound up with a chartulary, a visitation of churches, etc. See *The Domesday of St. Paul's*, ed. W. H. Hale (Camden Soc.), 1858, p. 140, and *R. de Diceto opera historica*, ed. W. Stubbs (Rolls Series), p. lvi.

Lent by the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's.

Rochester Chapter Library.

22. **Textus Roffensis**: a collection compiled in the time of Bishop Ernulph, who died in 1125, containing the ancient laws of Kent and of the Anglo-Saxon Kings of England and of William I., a chartulary of the lands of the church of Rochester, lists of early kings and bishops, etc. Written in the 12th century. See *Textus Roffensis* ed. T. Hearne, Oxford, 1720; B. Thorpe, *Ancient Laws* (Record Commission), 1840.

Lent by the Dean and Chapter of Rochester.

Society of Antiquaries, MS. 60.

23. **Liber Niger of Peterborough**: a register of charters and other documents relating to the Abbey, including a chronicle from 1192 to 1294, and, at the beginning, a tran-

script, of the 12th century, of a survey or 'Descriptio maneriorum abbacie de Burhc, de sicut Walterius archidiaconus eam recepit et saisivit in manum regis,' made on the property of the monastery being taken into the king's hands on the death of Abbot John de Sais, who died in Oct. 1125. See Dugdale's *Monasticon*, vol. i. p. 372, and *Chronicon Petroburgense*, ed. T. Stapleton (Camden Soc.), 1849, appx.

Lent by the Society of Antiquaries.

Ely, Chapter Library.

24. **Liber Eliensis**: History of the Cathedral Church of Ely, by Thomas the monk, and Richard the Prior; in three Books, including transcripts of charters. Written in the 12th century. See *Liber Eliensis*, ed. D. J. Stewart (Anglia Christiana Soc.), 1848.

Lent by the Dean and Chapter of Ely.

Castle Howard, co. York.

25. **Registrum Honoris de Richemunde**: being a collection of documents relating to the lands of the Honour of Richmond and including the survey, transcribed from 'libro in thesauria domini regis, vocato Domesday.' See another copy in Cotton MS. Faustina B. vii. Written in the 15th century, and illustrated with coloured drawings. Printed by R. Gale, 1722.

Lent by G. Howard, Esq.

Printed Books Exhibited in the British Museum.

Domesday Book, seu Liber Censualis Willelmi Primi Regis Angliæ, inter Archivos Regni in Domo Capitulari Westmonasterii asservatus; jubente Rege . . . Georgio Tertio prælo mandatus typis. [Edited by A. Farley.] Two vols. [London,] 1783, fol.

Published in 1783, without title-pages. The title-pages as given here were issued by the Record Commission in 1816 with the two additional volumes of 'Indices' and 'Additamenta,' edited by Sir H. Ellis.

Domesday Book, or, the Great Survey of England of William the Conqueror, A.D. 1086 . . . Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton, Colonel Sir H. James, Director. 35 pt. 1861-63, fol. and 4to.

The part exhibited relates to Cornwall. The quarto parts, taken from what is known as the 'Little Domesday Book,' contain the surveys of Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex.

Facsimile of the original Domesday Book, or the Great Survey of England, A.D. 1080 [*sic*], in the reign of William the Conqueror. With translation by General Plantagenet-Harrison. [Containing the Part for Middlesex only.] Head and Meek: London, 1876, fol.

The Domesday Book of Kent [a Facsimile], with translation, notes, and appendix, by the Rev. L. B. Larking. *On vellum*. J. Toovey : London, 1869, fol.

Historical Antiquities. . . . By Sir Peter Leycester. Whereunto is annexed a transcript of Doomsday Book, so far as it concerneth Cheshire, taken out of the Original Record. [Latin only.] London, 1673, fol.

The Natural History of Northamptonshire. . . . To which is annex'd a transcript of Doomsday Book, so far as it relates to that county. By J. Morton. [Latin only.] London, 1712, fol.

Wiltshire extracted from Domesday Book : to which is added a translation of the original Latin into English. With an Index. . . . By H. P. Wyndham. Salisbury, 1788, 8°.

Hampshire extracted from Domesday Book : with an accurate English translation, a preface, and an introduction. . . . By R. Warner. London, 1789, 4°.

Domesday Book for the County of Warwick, translated by W. Reader ; to which is prefixed a brief dissertation on Domesday Book, etc. *Lat. & Eng.* Coventry, 1835, 4°.

A literal extension of the Latin Text and an English Translation of Domesday Book, in relation to the County of Worcester, by W. B. Sanders. . . . To accompany the facsimile copy photozincographed . . . at the Ordnance Survey Office. Worcester, 1864, fol.

Similar extensions and translations have been made for Derbyshire (by L. Jewitt), Northamptonshire (by S. A. Moore), Middlesex, Surrey, Hampshire (by H. Moody), Warwick (by E. P. Shirley), Cornwall (extension only), Huntingdon (translation only).

Domesday for Wiltshire . . . accompanied with translations, illustrative notes, analysis of contents, and general introduction, by W. H. Jones. Bath, 1865, 4°.

The Devonshire Domesday. [Published by the Devonshire Association for the Advancement of Science, Literature, and Art.] *Lat. & Eng.* Plymouth, 1884, *etc.* 8°.

Now in progress.

Domesday ; or an actual survey of South-Britain . . . completed in . . . 1086 . . . faithfully translated, with an introduction, notes, and illustrations, by S. Henshall and J. Wilkinson . . . This number comprehends the counties of Kent, Sussex, and Surrey. London, 1799, 4°.

Dom Boc. A translation of the record called Domesday, so far as relates to the County of York, including Amounderness, Lonsdale, and Furness in Lancashire, and such parts of Westmorland and Cumberland as are contained in the Survey. Also the Counties of Derby, Nottingham, Rutland, and Lincoln. With an introduction, glossary, and indexes, by W. Bawdwen. Doncaster, 1809, 4°.

Dom Boc. A translation of the record called Domesday, so far as relates to the Counties of Middlesex, Hertford, Buckingham, Oxford, and Gloucester. By W. Bawdwen. Doncaster, 1812, 4°.

Domesday Book relating to Essex : translated by T. C. Chisenhale-Marsh. Chelmsford, 1864, 4°.

Uniform in size with the Ordnance Survey facsimile.

A translation of that portion of **Domesday Book** which relates to **Lincolnshire and Rutlandshire**. By C. Gowen Smith. London, [1871], 8°.

A short account of some particulars concerning Domesday Book, with a view to promote its being published. By a member of the Society of Antiquaries of London [P. C. Webb]. Read at a Meeting of the Society . . . 1755. London, 1756, 4°.

Contains, among other things, a list of the parts of Domesday already printed, and of the transcripts of parts of it in public or private hands. Bound up with this book is 'A short account of Danegeld, with some further particulars relating to Will. the Conqueror's Survey,' by the same author, 1756.

Domesday Book illustrated: containing an account of that antient record; as also of the tenants in capite or serjanty therein mentioned: and a translation of the difficult passages, with occasional notes. . . . By R. Kelham. London, 1788, 8°.

A Key to Domesday, showing the method and exactitude of its mensuration and the precise meaning of its more usual formulæ. The subject being specially exemplified by an analysis and digest of the Dorset Survey. By R. W. Eyton. Taylor & Co.: London, 1878, 4°.

Domesday Studies: An analysis and digest of the Somerset Survey (according to the Exon Codex) and of the Somerset Gheld Inquest of A.D. 1084, as collated with, and illustrated by, Domesday. By R. W. Eyton. 2 vols. Reeves & Turner: London, 1880, 4°.

A digest of the Domesday of Bedfordshire, being an analysis of that portion of the Domesday Survey which relates to the County of Bedford, and a Key to the facsimile edition of the same published by Government. By W. Airy . . . with preliminary note by. . . B. R. Airy. Bedford, 1881, fol.

DOMESDAY BIBLIOGRAPHY.

EDITED BY HENRY B. WHEATLEY, F.S.A.

Libri Censualis vocati Domesday Book [Domesday Book, seu Liber Censualis Willelmi Primi Regis Angliæ, inter Archivos Regni in Domo Capitulari Westmonasterii asservatus: jubente Rege . . . Georgio Tertio prælo mandatus typis.] [Edited by A. Farley]

VOL. I. (NO TITLE) [1783]. CHENTH, SUDSEXE, SUDRIE, HANTESCIRE, BERROCHESCIRE, WILTSCIRE, DORSETE, SUMERSETE, DEVENESCIRE, CORNVALGE, MIDELSEXE, HERFORDSCIRE, BOCHINGHAMSCIRE, OXENEFORDSCIRE, GLOWECESCIRE, WIRECESTRESCIRE, HEREFORDSCIRE, GRENTEBRIGESCIRE, HUNTEDUNSCIRE, BEDEFORDSCIRE, NORTHANTSCIRE, LEDECESCIRE, WARWICSCIRE, STATFORDSCIRE, SCIROPESCIRE, CESTRESCIRE, DERBYSCIRE, SNOTINGHAMSCIRE, EURVICSCIRE, LINCOLESCIRE.

VOL. II. (NO TITLE) [1783]. EXSESSA, NORDFOLC, SUDFULC.

VOL. III. (1816). General Introduction.

Indices: 1. Locorum, secundum ordinem comitatum.
2. Locorum et possessionum, generalis. 3. Nominum tenentium in capite. 4. Rerum præcipuarum.

VOL. IV. (1816). Additamenta ex Codic. Antiquiss.: Exon' Domesday, Inquisitio Eliensis, Liber Winton', Boldon Book.

Domesday Book, or the Great Survey of England of William the Conqueror, 1086; facsimile of the Part relating to each County, separately (with a few exceptions of double counties). Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command,

at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton, Colonel Sir Henry James, R.E., F.R.S., &c., Director. 35 Parts. Folio and 4to. 1861-1863.

The original Domesday Survey deposited in the Record Office is in two parts or volumes. The first, in folio, contains the counties of Bedford, Berks, Bucks, Cambridge, Chester and Lancaster, Cornwall, Derby, Devon, Dorset, Gloucester, Hants, Hereford, Herts, Huntingdon, Kent, Leicester and Rutland, Lincoln, Middlesex, Northampton, Nottingham, Oxford, Salop, Somerset, Stafford, Surrey, Sussex, Warwick, Wilts, Worcester, and York. The second volume, in quarto, contains the counties of Essex, Norfolk, and Suffolk. The work remained unprinted until it was published by the Government in 1783 and completed by the Record Commission in 1816.

Domesday ; or an Actual Survey of South Britain, by the Commissioners of William the Conqueror, completed in the year 1086, on the evidence of the Jurors of Hundreds, sanctioned by the authority of the County Jurors ; faithfully translated, with Introduction, Notes, and Illustrations, by Samuel Henshall and John Wilkinson. . . . This number comprehends the counties of Kent, Sussex, and Surrey. Number one, and ten similar numbers, will contain both volumes of the original. London, 1799, 4to, pp. vi, 268.

No more published.

Dom Boc. A Translation of the Record called Domesday, as far as relates to the county of York, including also Amounderness, Lonsdale, and Furness, in Lancashire, and such parts of Westmoreland and Cumberland as are contained in the Survey, also the Counties of Derby, Nottingham, Rutland, and Lincoln. With an Introduction, Glossary, and Indexes by the Rev. William Bawdwen, Vicar of Horton Pagnall, Yorkshire. Doncaster, 1809. 4to, title, dedication, pp. iv, 628 ; glossary and indexes, pp. 61.

At the end is a prospectus : 'Proposals for publishing by subscription in ten volumes, quarto, price twenty guineas, a translation of the whole of the Record called Domesday ; with an introduction and the modern names of places adapted as far as possible to those in the Record.'

Dom Boc. A Translation of the Record called Domesday, as far as relates to the Counties of Middlesex, Hertford, Buckingham, Oxford, and Gloucester. By the Rev. William Bawdwen. Doncaster, 1812. 4to.

Title, dedication 1 leaf ; Middlesex, pp. 26 ; Hertfordshire, pp. 76 ; Buckinghamshire, pp. 82 ; Oxfordshire, pp. 62 ; Gloucestershire, pp. 72. Indexes : Middlesex, 1 leaf ; Hertfordshire, pp. 4 ; Buckinghamshire, pp. 3 ; Oxfordshire, pp. 4 ; Gloucestershire, pp. 6.

A short account of some particulars concerning Domesday Book, with a view to promote its being published. By a Member of the Society of Antiquaries of London [Philip Carteret Webb]. London, 1756. 4to. pp. 21

Contains a valuable list of MSS. of parts of Domesday in public or private hands.

A short account of Danegeld : with some further particulars relating to Will. the Conqueror's Survey. By a Member of the Society of Antiquaries of London [Philip Carteret Webb]. London, 1756. 4to, pp. 38.

Domesday Book illustrated : Containing an account of that antient record ; as also of the Tenants in Capite or Serjanty therein mentioned ; and a Translation of the difficult passages, with occasional notes ; an Explanation of the terms, abbreviations, and names of foreign abbies : and an Alphabetical Table of the Tenants in Capite or Serjanty in the several Counties contained in that Survey. By Robert Kelham of Lincoln's Inn, Author of the Norman Dictionary. London,

Printed by John Nichols for Edward Brooke, 1788. 8vo, pp. viii. 399.

A Dissertation on Domesday Book. In 'History and Antiquities of the County of Leicester. By John Nichols,' 1795. Vol. i. pt. i. pp. xxxiii–liv.

A Dissertation on Domesday Book. In 'History and Antiquities of the County of Dorset. By John Hutchins.' Vol. iv. 1873. Appendix pp. i–xv. Exeter Domesday Book, pp. xvi–xix.

Preface to Domesday Book. Grose's 'Antiquities of England and Wales.' Vol. i. 1773, pp. 78–83.

A General Introduction to Domesday Book ; Accompanied by Indexes of the Tenants in Chief and Under-Tenants in the time of the Survey : as well as of the Holders of Lands mentioned in Domesday anterior to the formation of that record ; with an Abstract of the Population of England at the close of the reign of William the Conqueror, as far as the same is actually entered ; illustrated by numerous Notes and Comments. By Sir Henry Ellis, K.H., F.R.S., Sec. S. A., Principal Librarian of the British Museum. [London], 1833. 2 vols. 8vo.

vol. i. pp. xix, 515. Introduction. Index of Tenants in Capite. Vol. ii. pp. 543. Index of Persons, Monasteries, &c., entered as holding lands in the time of Edward the Confessor, and through later years anterior to the formation of the Survey ; Index of the Under-tenants of Lands at the formation of the Survey ; Abstract of the Population ; General Index.

History of the Norman Conquest, by E. A. Freeman. Chapter xxii. is devoted to the consideration of Domesday Book.

(vol. v. (1876) pp. 1–52.) The Appendix to this volume also contains several notes on Domesday.

Note A, pp. 733-740; note B, pp. 740-747, Notes of Time in Domesday; note F, pp. 769-778, 'Antecessores' of Domesday; note G, pp. 778-785, Leases and Sales in Domesday; note H, pp. 785-786, The use of the word 'vis' in Domesday; note K, pp. 798-800, Notices of Outlawry in Domesday; note L, pp. 801-804, Notices of Wives and Daughters in Domesday; note M, pp. 804-806, Grants of Alms in Domesday; note SS, pp. 885-887, Notices of Commendation in Domesday; note UU, pp. 888-889, Classes in Domesday.

England under the Norman Occupation. By James F. Morgan, M.A. London (Williams and Norgate), 1858. Sm. 8vo.

'This little work is an attempt to give the results of a careful perusal of the record called Domesday.'—*Preface*.

Chap. 1. The Domesday Book and the Conqueror's Survey. Chap. 2. The Measurement of Land. Chap. 3. Money, Rent, and Agricultural Affairs. Chap. 4. The Hall, the Church, and the Peasantry. Chap. 5. The Freehold Tenantry. Chap. 6. Boroughs and Cities. Chap. 7. Hundreds, Wapentakes, and Shires. Chap. 8. Titles, Offices, and Surnames. Chap. 9. Extinction of Villenage.

A Catalogue of all the Tenants in Capite or Serjanty that held all the Lands in every County of the King, as they are to be found in Domesday Book, set before each County. Appendix to An Introduction to the Old English History. By Robert Brady. London, 1684. Folio.

Catalogus Nobilium, qui immediatè prædia à Rege Conquæstore tenuerunt. Ex Censuali Angliæ Libro, quem ipse Conquæstor anno regni xx confici jussit. Pp. 374-380 of Maseres' 'Historiæ Anglicanæ circa tempus Conquestûs Angliæ à Gulielmo Notho, Normannorum Duce, Selecta Monumenta.' London, 1807.

This list of tenants *in capite* is in alphabetical order and contains the names of 447.

Recherches sur le Domesday, ou Liber Censualis d'Angleterre, contenant, 1° Une Introduction indiquant les Noms de ce registre, sa date présumée, les motifs de sa confection, le mode de son exécution, sa description, son utilité, son usage et sa publication; 2° une Table générale du Domesday Book, du Liber Wintoniæ et du Boston-Book [*sic*]; 3° un Glossaire, 4° une Statistique de l'Angleterre, par MM. Léchaudé d'Anisy et de Sainte-Marie. Tome 1, Caen (C. M. Lesaulnier), 1842. 4to, pp. 282. No more published.

The 'Table générale des tenants en chef et des sous-tenants,' which is very full, does not go farther than the letter A.

Index to the genealogies of the tenants in capite in Domesday Book. By [Sir] T[homas] P[hillipps].

s. sh. [Middlehill], n.d. Folio.

— With the counties in which they had possessions, in the year 1086, in Domesday Book. 1838. By T. P.

[Middlehill, 1838]. Folio.

— [As above], 1842, by T. P.

[Middlehill, 1842]. Folio.

Consuetudines et Jura Anglo-Saxonica, ex Libro Censuali dicto Doomesday. In 'T. Gale, Historiæ Britannicæ, Saxonicæ, Anglo-Danicæ Scriptores XV.' Oxoniæ, 1691, pp. 757-796. (Rerum Anglicarum Scriptores, tom. 3, Folio.)

Doubts and Conjectures concerning the reason commonly assigned for inserting or omitting the words 'Ecclesia' and 'Presbyter' in Domesday Book. By the Rev. Samuel Denne. *Archæologia*, vol. viii. 1787, pp. 218-238.

Churches in the Domesday Survey. By J. H. Walker, M.D. *Gentleman's Magazine*, N.S., vol. xix. 1843, pp. 485-489.

On a Reproduction of a Portion of the Domesday Book by the Photo-zincographic Process. By Joseph Burt, one of the

Assistant Keepers of Public Records. *Archæological Journal*, vol. xviii. 1861, pp. 128-133.

The Domesday Book [article by the late Mr. Toulmin Smith on Sir Henry James's Photo-zincograph facsimile, in which are given a notice of some of the Reproductions of the various Counties, and some valuable remarks on the origin of Domesday Book.

In **The Parliamentary Remembrancer**, vol. v. 1862, pp. 186-190.

See also vol. iv. (1861), p. 194, and vol. vi. (1863), pp. 178-180.

'Domesday Book is the story of the life of free England, written by the hands of the free Englishmen themselves of every separate county (except four) eight hundred years ago. It tells how they lived, what they did, and how they kept themselves free Englishmen.'

Ueber das französische Sprachelement im Liber Censualis Wilhelms I. von England (Exchequer und Exon Domesday Book). Dissertatio inauguralis quam . . . scripsit Fredericus Hildebrand. Halis Saxonum, 1844. 8vo.

[Prospectus of] the **Domesday Book Society** . . . [Signed by Walter de Gray Birch]. [Lond., Apr. 1885.] 4to.

Bedfordshire.

Domesday Book; Facsimile of the part relating to Bedfordshire. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Bedfordshire.

See **DOMESDAY BOOK**, *Folio*. vol. i. ff. 209-218b; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 56-57.

A Digest of the Domesday of Bedfordshire, being an Analysis of that portion of the Domesday Survey which relates to the County of Bedford, and a Key to the facsimile edition of the same published by Government. By William Airy, M.A. . . . Bedford, 1881. Folio, pp. 108.

With a preliminary note by the editor's son, Basil Reginald Airy, M.A.

Berkshire.

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Berkshire. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book ; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Berkshire.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, Folio. vol. i. ff. 56-63*b* ; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 14-16.

Buckinghamshire.

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Buckinghamshire. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book ; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Buckinghamshire.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, Folio. vol. i. ff. 143-153 ; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 38-40.

Translation : *see* DOM BOC by BAWDWEN, 1812 (p. 665).

Cambridgeshire.

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Cambridgeshire. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book ; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Cambridgeshire.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. vol. i. ff. 189-202*b* ; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 52-54.

Inquisitio Eliensis.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. vol. iv. pp. 497-528 ; Index Locorum, vol. iv. pp. 615-617 ; Index Nominum, vol. iv. pp. 618-620.

On the Measurements and Valuations of the Domesday of Cambridgeshire. Communicated by the Rev. Bryan Walker, LL.D., Nov. 28, 1881. Cambridge Antiquarian Society Communications, vol. 5, pp. 95-129.

The various points dealt with by the author are arranged under the following eight heads :—1. On Hides and their size. 2. On Caruca and Terra ad Carucam. 3. On Domesday Acres. 4. On Bovates. 5. On Hidation. 6. On the Domesday Valuation (Valet) of Manors and Holdings. 7. On the Population of the County. 8. On the Minor Incidents of Value.

Supplement containing a Tabular Analysis of the Cambridgeshire Domesday. Cambridge, 1884 (Supplement to vol. 5). *Folio*.

Cheshire.

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Cheshire. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book ; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Cheshire.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. vol. i. ff. 262*b*-269 ; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 74-76.

Miscellanea Palatina ; consisting of Genealogical Essays, illustrative of Cheshire and Lancashire Families, and a Memoir of the Cheshire Domesday Roll (Ormerod). 1851-56, 8vo.

A Transcript of Cheshire at large, out of the Greater Domesday Book, remaining on record in the Tally Office at Westminster, belonging to the custody of the Treasurer and the two Chamberlains of the Exchequer at London. According as the same was transcribed by Mr. Squire from the Record itself, A.D. 1649. London, 1672, pp. 393-436 of 'Historical Antiquities, in two Books . . . by Sir Peter Leycester. London, 1673.' Folio.

Cornwall.

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Cornwall. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book ; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Cornwall.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. vol. i. ff. 120-125 ; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 32-35.

Exon Domesday.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. vol. iv. pp. 1-493 ; Index Nominum Tenentium in Capite, vol. iv. pp. 589, 590 ; Index Locorum, vol. iv. pp. 591-602 ; Index Nominum Personarum, vol. iv. pp. 603-614.

A Literal Extension of the Text of Domesday Book in relation to the County of Cornwall. To accompany the facsimile copy photo-zincographed, under the direction of Colonel Sir H. James, R.E., F.R.S., at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton. London (Vacher & Sons), 1861. Folio, title, preface one leaf, pp. 22.

Cumberland.

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Cumberland (Manors of Witingha, Bodele, and Santacherche only). Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton, 1861.

Domesday Book ; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Cumberland (Manors of Witingha, Bodele, and Santacherche only).

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. vol. i. p. 301*b*.

Translation of portion : *see* DOM BOC by BAWDWEN, 1809 (p. 664.)

Derbyshire.

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Derbyshire. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book ; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Derbyshire.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. vol. i. ff. 272-278b; Index
Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 78-80.

Translation : see DOM Boc by BAWDWEN, 1809 (p. 664).

Domesday Book of Derbyshire ; Temp. William the Conqueror, 1068 ; extended Latin Text ; and Literal Translation. Edited, with notes, glossary, indices, &c., &c., by Llewellyn Jewitt, F.S.A. London : Bemrose & Sons, 1871. *Folio*, pp. 72.

The Domesday Book for the County of Derby. By John Pym Yeatman. London and Oxford. 8vo.

Devonshire.

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Devonshire. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book ; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Devonshire.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. vol. i. ff. 100-118b ; Index
Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 26-32.

Exon Domesday.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. vol. iv. pp. 1-493 ; Index Nominum
Tenentium in Capite, vol. iv. pp. 589-590 ; Index Locorum,
vol. iv. pp. 591-602 ; Index Nominum Personarum, vol. iv.
pp. 603-614.

The Devonshire Domesday. (Extensions and Translations in course of publication by the Devonshire Association, to form an Exeter volume of the Transactions. Part I., 1884, pp. 1-97 ; part II., 1885, pp. 97-284 ; part III., 1886, pp. 285-488 ; part IV., 1887, pp. 489-561 ; part V., 1888, pp. 564-674 ; part VI., 1889, pp. 675-834 ; part VII., 1890, pp. 835-986 ; part VIII., 1891, pp. 987-1146.) Plymouth. 8vo.

Dorsetshire.

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Dorsetshire. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book ; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Dorsetshire.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. vol. i. ff. 75-85 ; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 19-21.

Exon Domesday.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. vol. iv. pp. 1-493 ; Index Nominum Tenentium in Capite, vol. iv. pp. 589-590 ; Index Locorum, vol. iv. pp. 591-602 ; Index Nominum Personarum, vol. iv. pp. 603-614.

Domesday Book for the County (with the contractions extended in *italics*). In 'History and Antiquities of the County of Dorset, by John Hutchins.' 3rd ed. vol. iv. 1873, pp. xx-xlvi.

Index to the Names of Places, pp. xlviii-l. Possessors of Land in the time of Edward the Confessor, p. li.

Translation of the Record called Domesday, so far as it relates to the County of Dorset, by the Rev. Wm. Bawdwen, in the second edition 1815, pp. 47-83.

A Key to Domesday, showing the method of exactitude of its Mensuration and the precise meaning of its more usual formulæ: the Subject being specially exemplified by an Analysis and Digest of the Dorset Survey. By the Rev. R. W. Eyton. London and Dorchester, 1878, 4to, pp. iv, 176

Contents : Preface—Introductory Essay on Hidation and the Domesday Hide ; Carucates and Ploughlands ; lineal measures in Domesday ; areal or superficial measures of Domesday ; the territory surveyed in Domesday (Royal Forests, 'Silva' of Domesday, 'Pastura' of Domesday, 'Pratum' of Domesday, Mills, Churches and Church Lands) ; Population (Agricultural : viz. Censores, Coliberti, Villani, Bordarii, Cotarii, Servi, Ancillæ ; Industrial : viz. Salinarii, Piscatores, Fabri, Burgesses) ; Farming Stock (Plough Teams employed) ; Values, Valuations, and Rents of Domesday ; Theories tested by examples.—Chapter i. The four Dorset boroughs surveyed in Domesday—ii. Domesday schedule of Dorset landholders ; notices of individual landholders—iii. Terra Regis of the Dorset Domesday : Vetust Dominium Coronæ (Portland group of Domesnes, Bridetone group, Wimborne group, Dorchester group, Pimperne group, Winfrith group, Tables of groups of Domesnes), Terra Regis per Escaetam—iv. The pre-Domesday hundreds of Dorset—v. Domesday hidage compared with modern acreage—vi. Domesday mensuration and valuation, Dorset—vii. Statistics : table of Dorset fiefs, their relative hidage and population ; adult male population of Dorset, A.D. 1086 and A.D. 1871 ; values of land and of produce, A.D. 1086 and A.D. 1878 ; agricultural population, ploughlands, and teams, A.D. 1086 ; hides and statute acres again compared ; Domesday distribution of Dorset lands—Index of Places—Index of Persons.

On the Family and Connexions of Robert Fitzgerald, the Domesday Tenant of Corfe. By J. R. Planché. In *Journal of the British Archæological Association*, vol. xxviii. (1872), pp. 113-122.

Durham.

Beldon Book.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. vol. iv. pp. 565-587 ; Index Locorum, vol. iv. pp. 631-632 ; Index Nominum Personarum, vol. iv. pp. 633-635.

Essex.

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Essex. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book ; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Essex.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio.* vol. ii. ff. 1-107 ; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 111-116.

Inquisitio Eliensis.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio.* vol. iv. pp. 497-528 ; Index Locorum, vol. iv. pp. 615-617 ; Index Nominum, vol. iv. pp. 618-620.

Domesday Book relating to Essex ; Translated by T. C. Chisenhale-Marsh. Chelmsford (W. D. Burrell), 1864. 4to.

Gloucestershire.

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Gloucestershire. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book ; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Gloucestershire.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio.* vol. i. ff. 162-170b ; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 43-46.

Translation : *see* DOM BOC by BAWDWEN, 1812 (p. 665).

Some Account of the Landowners of Gloucestershire named in Domesday Book, A.D. 1086. By Alfred S. Ellis. Not published. 1880, 8vo. (Reprinted from the Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archæological Society, vol. iv.)

Hampshire.

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Hampshire. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book ; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Hampshire.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. vol. i. ff. 37*b*–54 ; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 10–13.

Liber Winton.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. vol. iv. pp. 531–562 ; Index Locorum, vol. iv. p. 621 ; Index Nominum, vol. iv. pp. 622–630.

Hampshire extracted from Domesday Book : with an accurate English Translation ; a Preface and an Introduction, containing an Account of this Curious Record, a View of the Anglo-Saxon History, and Form of Government from the Reign of Alfred, together with a Slight Sketch of the most Material Alterations which the latter underwent at the period of the Conquest, to which is added a Glossary, explanatory of the Obscure and Obsolete Words. By Richard Warner, Junior, of Sway, in the County of Southampton, and of Mary Hall, Oxford. London, 1789. 4to, pp. xvii, xlvi, 319 ; Glossary, pp. 8. Also forming vol. ii. of "Collections for the History of Hampshire, and the Bishopric of Winchester by D. Y.," commonly, but erroneously, known as Warner's work.

Notes and Essays, archæological, historical, and topographical, relating to the counties of Hants and Wilts, by Henry Moody. Winchester and London, 1851. 8vo.

[The second essay is on 'The Domesday book of Hants and Wilts,' and occupies pp. 12–24. It deals with general matters only.]

Herefordshire.

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Herefordshire. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book ; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Herefordshire.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. vol. i. ff. 179-187*b* ; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 49-52.

Names of Places and of Landed Proprietors in Domesday Book. In 'Collections towards the History and Antiquities of the county of Hereford, by John Duncumb.' Vol. I. 1804, pp. 59-65.

Hertfordshire.

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Hertfordshire. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book ; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Hertfordshire.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. vol. i. ff. 132-142*b* ; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 36-38.

Translation : *see* DOM BOC by BAWDWEN, 1812 (p. 665).

Inquisitio Eliensis.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. vol. iv. pp. 497-528 ; Index Locorum, vol. iv. pp. 615-617 ; Index Nominum, vol. iv. pp. 618-620.

It is stated on the title-page of Chauncy's 'Historical Antiquities of Hertfordshire,' 1700, that that book contains an Exact

Transcript of Domesday Book so far as concerns this Shire and the Translation thereof in English ; but there are only some notes on the Survey at p. 9.

Huntingdonshire.

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Huntingdonshire. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book ; Type facsimile of the part relating to Huntingdonshire.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio.* vol. i. ff. 203-208*b* ; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 54-55.

Inquisitio Eliensis.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio.* vol. iv. pp. 497-528 ; Index Locorum, vol. iv. pp. 615-617 ; Index Nominum, vol. iv. pp. 618-620.

Translation of Domesday Book, or the Great Survey of England of William the Conqueror, A.D. mlxxxvi., with notes and explanations so far as relates to Huntingdonshire. Huntingdon (Robert Edis), 1864. Folio, pp. 28.

Kent.

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Kent. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book ; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Kent.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio.* vol. i. ff. 1-14 ; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 1-4.

Translation: *see* DOMESDAY by HENSHALL and WILKINSON, 1799 (p. 664).

The Domesday Book of Kent. With Translations, Notes, and Appendix. By the Rev. Lambert Blackwell Larking, M.A., late Vicar of Ryarsh, Kent. London: James Toovey, 1869. Large folio, pp. x; Facsimile, 28 plates, pp. 190; Appendix, pp. 55.

This magnificent book consists of twenty-eight plates of facsimile of the original; Extension; Concordance; Index of Names and Titles; Translation; Notes; Appendix, containing notes on special points; Tabular View of Manors, alphabetically arranged; Names of Places, ancient and modern; Index to Hundreds, Manors, &c., with references to Hasted. (The British Museum possesses a copy on vellum.)

The Domesday Survey; Its importance in all questions affecting lands in Kent—Ancient Dimensions of Land—Gulings—Ploughlands, or Carucates—Dimensions of the Kentish Ploughland—Gulings—Yokes—Oxgangs—Varieties of Gavelkind—Copyholds in Kent—Villeinage—Military and Spiritual Tenures.

In 'Tenures of Kent,' by C. I. Elton, 1867, cap. vi. pp. 113-151.

Lancashire.

Domesday Book; Facsimile of the part relating to Lancashire. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

See Facsimile of the parts relating to Cheshire and Lancashire.

Domesday Book; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Lancashire ('inter Ripam et Mersham').

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. *Southern portion* ('terra inter Ripam et Mersham'), vol. i. ff. 269b-270; Index Locorum, vol. iii. p. 77. *Northern portion* (returned as part of Yorkshire under the heading 'Agemundrenesse'), vol. i. ff. 301b, 302, and 332; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 85-97.

Translation of portions of: see DOM BOC by BAWDWEN, 1809 (p. 664).

Leicestershire.

Domesday Book; Facsimile of the part relating to Leicestershire. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Leicestershire.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. vol. i. ff. 230-237; Index Locorum vol. iii. pp. 62-64.

Leicestershire, extracted from Domesday Book, with an English Translation. In 'History and Antiquities of the County of Leicester. By John Nichols.' 1795. Vol. i. pt. 1

Lincolnshire.

Domesday Book; Facsimile of the part relating to Lincolnshire. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Lincolnshire.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. vol. i. ff. 336-371; Clamores, ff. 375-377b; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 100-110.

Translation : *see* DOM BOC by BAWDWEN, 1809 (p. 664).

Lincolnshire and Rutlandshire. A Translation of that portion of Domesday Book which relates to Lincolnshire and Rutlandshire. By Charles Gowen Smith. London (Simpkin, Marshall, & Co.) [1870]. 8vo, pp. xlviii, 276.

Contains an Introduction, Glossary, and Index to principal entries.

Middlesex.

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Middlesex. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book ; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Middlesex.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. vol. i. ff. 126b-130b ; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 35-36.

Translation : *see* DOM BOC by BAWDWEN, 1812 (p. 665).

A Literal Extension of the Latin text, and an English Translation of Domesday Book in relation to the County of Middlesex, to accompany the facsimile copy photo-zincographed, under the direction of Col. Sir H. James, R.E., F.R.S., at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton. London (Vacher & Sons, Longmans), 1862. Folio, pp. vi, 33, indexes 2 leaves.

The publishers proposed to publish the whole of Domesday in the same manner county by county.

Facsimile of the original Domesday Book, or the Great Survey of England, A.D. 1080 (*sic*), in the reign of William the

Conqueror. With translation by General Plantagenet-Harrison. London, 1876. Folio, pp. [22].

Norfolk.

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Norfolk. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book ; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Norfolk.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. vol. ii. ff. 109-280; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 116-126.

Inquisitio Eliensis.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. vol. iv. pp. 497-528; Index Locorum, vol. iv. pp. 615-617; Index Nominum, vol. iv. pp. 618-620.

An Analysis of the Domesday Book of the County of Norfolk. By the Rev. George Munford, Vicar of East Winch. London, J. Russell Smith, 1858. 8vo, pp. xv, 142.

This volume is full of valuable references.

Northamptonshire.

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Northamptonshire. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book ; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Northamptonshire.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. vol. i. ff. 219-229; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 58-61.

A Transcript of Domesday Book, so far as it concerns Northamptonshire, pp. 46. Index of the Towns mentioned in the Extract of Northamptonshire from Domesday Book, pp. ix-x. At the end of 'The Natural History of Northamptonshire. By John Morton. London, 1712.' Folio.

Domesday Book. The portion relating to Northamptonshire, extended and translated by Stuart A. Moore. Northampton, Mark Dolman, 1863. Folio, pp. xv 98.

This volume contains a valuable index of names.

Nottinghamshire.

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Nottinghamshire. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book ; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Nottinghamshire.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio.* vol. i. ff. 280-293; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 81-84.

Translation : *see* DOM BOC by BAUSDEN, 1809 (p. 664).

Oxfordshire.

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Oxfordshire. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book ; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Oxfordshire.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio.* vol. i. ff. 154-161; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 40-42.

Translation : *see* DOM BOC by BAUSDEN, 1812 (p. 665).

The Early History of Oxford, 727-1100. By James Parker. [With Illustrations.] Oxford, for the Oxf. Hist. Soc., 1885, 8vo, pp. 32 + 420.

[Chap. xi., pp. 221-304, contains an elaborate account of 'The Description of Oxford in 1086 as given in the Domesday Survey,' with a facsimile of part of the Survey.]

Rutland.

NOTE.—*Part of Rutland is described in the Counties of Northampton and Lincoln.*

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Rutland. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

See Facsimile of the parts relating to Leicestershire and Rutland.

Domesday Book ; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Rutland.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio.* vol. i. ff. 293b-294 ; Index Locorum, vol. iii. p. 84.

Translation : *see* DOM BOC by BAWDWEN, 1809 (p. 664).

A Translation of that portion of Domesday Book which relates to Rutlandshire. By Charles Gowen Smith. *See* under Lincolnshire.

Shropshire.

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Shropshire. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book ; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Shropshire.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio.* vol. i. ff. 252-260b; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 70-73.

Somersetshire.

Domesday Book; Facsimile of the part relating to Somerset. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Somerset.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio.* vol. i. ff. 86-99; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 22-26.

Exon Domesday.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio.* vol. iv. pp. 1-493; Index Nominum Tenentium in Capite, vol. iv. pp. 589-590; Index Locorum, vol. iv. pp. 591-602; Index Nominum Personarum, vol. iv. pp. 603-614.

Domesday Studies; an analysis and digest of the Somerset Survey (according to the Exon Codex) and of the Somerset Gheld Inquest of A.D. 1084, as collated with and illustrated by Domesday. By the Rev. R. W. Eyton. London and Bristol, 1880. 2 vols. 4to, pp. v, 225; 75.

Contents: vol. i.: Preface—Introductory Essay; area of Somerset; Domesday Hidation; the Hide of Somerset; Carucates and Ploughlands; lineal measures of Domesday; areal or superficial measures; the territory surveyed in Domesday (Royal and other Forests of Somerset, 'Pascua' of the Somerset Survey, 'Pratum' of the Somerset Survey, 'Terra Vasta' of the Somerset Survey, the Somerset Moorlands, Vineyards, Mills, Churches, Church Lands); Domesday Population of Somerset (Ancillæ, Gabulatores, Villani, Bordarii, Cotarii, Servi, Piscatores, Fabri, Burgenses);

Farming Stock of the Somerset Survey ; Values, Valuations, and Rents.—Chapter i. The Royal Burghs of Somerset—ii. Domesday schedule of Somerset landholders ; notice of individual landholders—iii. Terra Regis of Somerset (*Vetus Dominium Coronæ*) ; lands of the escheated earldom ; lands of the late Queen Edith ; lands of Wulfward White, deceased—iv. The old hundreds of Somerset ; the Gheld, inquest of, A.D. 1084 ; old indices of Somerset hundreds ; hundreds assessed by the Gheld, inquest of A.D. 1084 ; Hundreds not assessed by the extant Inquests of A.D. 1084 ; non-identified manors of the Somerset Survey—v. Non-hidated liberties of Somerset ; estate of the Church of St. John at Frome ; abbatial liberty of Muchelney—vi. Appendix of Observations and Statistics ; Omissions of the Somerset Domesday ; post-Domesday Hundred of Whitley ; Domesday fiefs of Somerset, Statistics of Population, annual revenues and values of Somerset lands, the farm labourer at the time of Domesday, Domesday distribution of Somerset lands.

vol. ii. : Tables ; Terra Regis in Somerseta ; *vetus dominium Coronæ*, estates of the Crown ; *mansiones de comitatu*, estates of the earldom ; *terræ quas tenuit Editha Regina*, estates of the late Queen Edith ; *terra quæ fuit Wlwardi Wite*, estates of the late Wulward White—The hundreds and liberties of Somerset, synoptical table ; Hundreds and liberties assessed in the extant Gheld Inquests of A.D. 1084 ; Hundreds and liberties not so assessed ; Hundreds and liberties named in old indices ; Hundreds and liberties not so named—Domesday manors of Somerset not yet identified—pre-Domesday franchise of the Church of St. John at Frome—pre-Domesday Liberty of Muchelney Abbey—the Somerset Domesday arranged according to fiefs—Index of Places—Index of Persons—Corrigenda.

Staffordshire.

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Staffordshire. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book ; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Staffordshire.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. vol. i. ff. 246-250b; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 67-70.

Domesday Studies ; An analysis and digest of the Staffordshire survey, treating of the mensuration technicalities, phraseology, and method of Domesday in its relation to Staffordshire, and to other counties of the same circuit ; with tables and notes reproducing the main features of the Domesday Survey of the County, and comparing the same with existing conditions. By the Rev. R. W. Eyton. London and Stafford, 1881. 8vo, pp. vii, 135.

Contents: cap. i. Limits of the Domesday county ; post-Domesday changes in the boundaries of Staffordshire ; certain Staffordshire manors omitted in Domesday ; Staffordshire estates apparently excluded from the survey virtually included therein ; the Domesday county and the present county compared—ii. Internal state of Staffordshire A.D. 1086—iii. Domesday hundreds of Staffordshire ; sites of manors often traceable when Domesday names are obsolete ; enumeration of Staffordshire estates whose Domesday names are obsolete—iv. The Domesday fiefs of Staffordshire—v. Tables of the five Staffordshire hundreds—vi. The Staffordshire Domesday arranged according to fiefs ; Staffordshire and Dorset contrasted—Index of Places—Index of Persons—Errata and Addenda.

Suffolk.

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Suffolk. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book ; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Suffolk.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio.* vol. ii. ff. 281-450; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 127-144.

Inquisitio Eliensis.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio.* vol. iv. pp. 497-528; Index Locorum, vol. iv. pp. 615-617; Index Nominum, vol. iv. pp. 618-620.

Surrey.

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Surrey. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book ; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Surrey.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio.* vol. i. ff. 30-36; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 8-9.

Translation : see DOMESDAY by HENSHALL and WILKINSON, 1799 (p. 664).

Sudrie comitatus descriptio, e Libro Censuali Gulielmi Conquestoris, vulgo vocato Domesday Book, apographice desumpta. Versione Anglicana donavit, commentario auxit, notis denique illustravit Owen Manning, S.T.B., Vicarius de Godelming. MDCCCLXXIII. In 'History and Antiquities of the County of Surrey, by Owen Manning and William Bray.' 1804. Vol. i.

The first facsimile of a whole county ever undertaken.

A Literal Extension of the Latin text, and an English Translation of Domesday Book in relation to the County of Surrey. To accompany the facsimile copy photo-zincographed, under the direction of Colonel Sir H. James, R.E., F.R.S., at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton. London (Vacher & Sons), 1862.

Folio, pp. v, 52. Index of Hundreds ; General Index of Places, with the tenants-in-chief at the time of Domesday Survey ; General Index of Names of all persons appearing on the Record, pp. viii.

Sussex.

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Sussex. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book ; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Sussex.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. vol. i. ff. 16-29 ; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 5-8.

Translation : *see* DOMESDAY by HENSHALL and WILKINSON, 1799 (p. 664).

Extract from the Domesday Survey of the lands subject to the Archbishop of Canterbury in Sussex. Journal of the British Archæological Association, vol. xxiii. 1867, pp. 334, 338.

Domesday Book in relation to the county of Sussex. Edited for the Sussex Archæological Society by W. D. Parish, Vicar of Selmeston, Sussex, Chancellor of Chichester Cathedral. Sussex, H. Wolff, 64 High Street, Lewes. 1886. Folio, pp. xiv-xxviii, 138.

Contents : Introduction, Facsimile, Extension and Translation of the Latin Text, Index of Tenants, Index of Names of Places mentioned in the Record, with Notes and suggested Identifications, Explanation of Words and Phrases. With a coloured map of Domesday Sussex. [By F. E. Sawyer, F.S.A.]

Warwickshire.

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Warwickshire. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book ; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Warwickshire.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. vol. i. ff. 238-244^b ; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 65-67.

Domesday Book, for the County of Warwick, translated by William Reader ; to which is prefixed a Brief Dissertation on Domesday Book, and Biographical Notices of the Ancient Possessors from the best Authorities. Coventry (W. Reader), 1835, 4to, pp. xxx, 93 ; Second Edition, with a Brief Introduction, by Evelyn Philip Shirley. Warwick, H. T. Cooke & Sons [1879], 4to, pp. viii, 38.

Notes on the Domesday of Warwickshire. By Charles Twamley. In *Archæological Journal*, vol. xxi. (1864), pp. 373-376.

Westmoreland.

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Westmoreland. (Manors of Castretune, Berebrune, Middeltun, Manzserge, Cherchebi, Lupetun, Prestun, Holme, Bortun, Hotune, Stercaland, Mimet, Cherchebi, Helsingetune, Steintun, Bodelforde, Hotun, Bortun, and Patun). Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

See under Lancashire in Facsimile of the parts relating to Cheshire and Lancashire.

Domesday Book ; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Westmoreland. (Manors of Castretune, Berebrune, Middeltun, Manzserge, Cherchebi, Lupetun, Prestun, Holme, Bortun, Hotune, Stercaland, Mimet, Cherchebi, Helsingetune, Steintun, Bodelforde, Hotun, Bortun, and Patun.)

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. vol. i. ff. 301*b*–302 ; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 85–97.

Translation of portion : *see* DOM BOC by BAWDWEN, 1809 (p. 664).

Wiltshire.

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Wiltshire. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book ; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Wiltshire.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. vol. i. ff. 64*b*–74*b* ; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 16–19.

Exon Domesday.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. vol. iv. pp. 1–493 ; Index Nominum Tenentium in Capite, vol. iv. pp. 589–590 ; Index Locorum, vol. iv. pp. 591–602 ; Index Nominum Personarum, vol. iv. pp. 603–614.

Wiltshire extracted from **Domesday Book** ; To which is added a translation of the Original Latin into English. With an Index in which are adapted the Modern Names to the Ancient ; and with a preface, in which is included a plan for a General History of the County. By Henry Penruddocke Wyndham. Salisbury. Printed by E. Eāston, 1788. 8vo, pp. xlii, 535

Domesday for Wiltshire. Extracted from Accurate Copies of the Original Records, accompanied with Translations, Illustrative Notes, Analysis of Contents, and General Introduction, by William Henry Jones, M.A., F.S.A., Rural Dean, Vicar of Bradford-on-Avon. Bath (R. E. Peach), 1865. 4to, pp. lxxvii, 255.

Contents: 1. General Introduction. 2. The Exchequer Domesday for Wiltshire. 3. The Exon Domesday for Wiltshire. 4. Analysis of the Domesday for Wiltshire. 5. General Index.

Worcestershire.

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Worcestershire. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book ; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Worcestershire.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. vol. i. ff. 172-178 ; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 47-49.

Observations on Domesday for Worcestershire (with copperplate facsimile of the original), [1775]. Appendix to [Nash's] 'Collections for the History of Worcestershire,' 1782, vol. ii.

Ea pars libri de Domesday, quæ ad Ecclesiam pertinet Wigorniensem. *Hemingi Chartularium* (Hearne), 1723, pp. 481-512.

A Literal Extension of the Latin Text ; and an English Translation of Domesday Book in relation to the County of Worcester. By W. B. Sanders. To accompany the facsimile copy photo-zincographed, under the direction of Colonel Sir H. James, R.E., F.R.S., at the Ordnance Survey Office, South-

ampton. Worcester (Deighton & Son), 1864. Folio, title, preface 1 leaf, pp. 50.

Index of Hundreds, General Index of Places, with the Tenants-in-chief at the time of Domesday Survey, General Index of Names of all persons appearing on the Record, pp. ix.

Yorkshire.

Domesday Book ; Facsimile of the part relating to Yorkshire. Photo-zincographed, by Her Majesty's command, at the Ordnance Survey Office, Southampton.

Domesday Book ; Type-facsimile of the part relating to Yorkshire.

See DOMESDAY BOOK, *Folio*. vol. i. ff. 298-333 ; Index Locorum, vol. iii. pp. 85-99.

Clamores, ff. 373-382.

Translation : *see* DOM BOC by BAWDWEN, 1809 (p. 664).

Some Account of the Landholders of Yorkshire named in Domesday Book, A.D. 1086. By Alfred S. Ellis. Not published. 1878, 8vo. (Reprinted from the Yorkshire Archæological Journal, where the papers are entitled 'Biographical Notes on the Yorkshire Tenants named in Domesday Book.')

Registrum Honoris de Richmond, exhibens Terrarum et Villarum quæ quondam fuerunt Edwini comitis infra Richmondshire descriptionem, ex Libro Domesday. 1722. Folio.

MANUSCRIPTS.

Tractatus de usu et obscurioribus verbis Libri de Domesday.
By Arthur Agarde. Cotton. MS. Vitellius ix.

Abridgment omitting several of the Counties, written about
the year 1200. Arundel MS. 153.

Abridgment for the County of Kent, written in the 12th
century. Cotton. MS. Vitellius cviii.

Inquisitio Cantabrigiensis. Cotton. MS. Tiberius A vi.

INDEX.

ABB

- ABBREVIATIO, the, of Domesday Book, 62
 Acre, a day's ploughing represented by the, 60
 — as applied to meadow-land, 218
 — as lineal measure, 220
 — list of, in United Kingdom, 292, 370, 565
 — the statute, 294, 373
 — gheld, 326
 — foreign, 370
 — big, 372
 — foot based on the, 375, 565
 — Anglesea, 292
 — Cheshire, 274, 285, 300
 — Cornish, 279, 300, 371
 — Devonshire, 258, 565
 — Irish, 262, 282-286, 303
 — — in Carew's MSS., 281 *et seq.*
 — — Cunningham, 286, 372
 — Scotch, 371
 — Welsh, 266 *et seq.*, 275 *et seq.*, 298, 372
 — Westmoreland, 269, 270, 306
 — Wiltshire, 300
 Ager, 278, 371
 Agriculture, two-field and three-field systems of, 144, 611
 Aids, the Book of, 642
 Alfred and Guthrum's treaty, fines under, for blood-shedding, 243

ASI

- Allotment, method of, 311 *et seq.*
 'Ancient Demesne, on an alleged instance of the Fallibility of Domesday in regard to,' by Sir Henry Barkly, K.C.B., 471-483
 Ancient Demesne, appeal to Domesday as to verification of, 532
 Andredesweald, Sussex and Surrey vaguely divided by, 460
Anglicus numerus, see 'Numeration, *post*
 — — its relation to the hide, 350-360
 Anglo-Saxons, their dislike of William's Survey, 8, 25, 26
 — — their duodecimal counting, 29-33, 317, 351
 — — their 'long hundred,' 33, 317, 351
 Anglo-Saxon Chronicle quoted as to origin of the Survey, 8, 492
 Apothecaries' weight, origin of, 241
 Arable land, its division between lords and tenants, 51
Arca, description of, in the 'Dialogus,' 529
Arcae, their uses, 520
 'Arpent,' the continental, 564
 As, Bede on the subdivisions of the, 616
 Asia, rights of pasturage in, 39
 — value of land, and land tenure n, 40

ASI

- Asia, sexdecimal measurements in, 570
 Assessment of land, unit of, 205, 227
et seq.
 — — pound-paying unit of, 301, 326
et seq., 353, 612, 615
- BALLIAGES, their imperfect correspondence with shires, 388
- Bally-betagh, food-paying unit, 251, 283, 301
- Barkly, Sir Henry, K.C.B., on 'An alleged instance of the Fallibility of Domesday in regard to Ancient Demesne,' 471-483
- Battle Abbey Charters, as to acreage of 'one plough,' 18
 — — — as to meadow-land acres, 219
 — — — as to reduction of assessment at Alceston, 551
 — — measurement of lands of, 271
- Bawdwen, the Rev. Wm., his Domesday MSS., 510
- Beachy Head, Domesday elucidation of name, 456
- Bear-baiting, mention of, in Domesday, 22
- Bede, on the duodecimal system of land measurement, 615
 — on the subdivisions of the As, or unit of aggregations, 616
- Benedictines, establishment of, at Nympsfield, 478, 480
- Bengeworth and Hampton, Survey decision of a question concerning, 542, 545, *note*
- Berkshire Survey, paucity of churches in, 435, 438
 — — mention of Presbyters in, 441
 — — list of facsimiles of, 670
- Betchworth, changes in the manor of, 463
- 'Bibliography of Domesday Book,' edited by H. B. Wheatley, F.S.A., 663-695
- Birch, W. de G., F.S.A., on 'The Materials for the re-editing of the

BUR

- Domesday Book, and suggestions for the formation of a Domesday Book Society,' 485-515
- Bishoprics, transfer of, 411
- Bishops, English, land held by, 405
 — Norman, English manors held by, 401
- Boldon Book, payment in kind to artificers shown by, 53
 — — size of carucate implied in, 161, 175
 — — history of, 630
- Bordarii* and *Cotarii*, distribution of, in Surrey, 469
- Boroughs, early assessment of, in terms of hundreds, 118
- Bovates, proportion of, to carucates, 159, 173, 203
- Bradshaw, John, *Dialogus de Scaccario* written by, 534
- Brehon laws, Irish weights according to, 240
 — — duodecimal land measurement in, 264
 — — Irish divisions of land and money shown by, 327
- Breviate, the, of Domesday Book, 630
 — — comparison of, with the Exchequer Domesday, 501
- British Museum, MSS. exhibited (1886) at the, 651-657
 — — printed books exhibited (1886) at the, 659-662
- Buckinghamshire, hundreds and wapentakes in, 75
 — facsimiles of Survey of, 670
- Buckland, Frank, as to the arithmetic of the Cromer crab-fishers, 34
- Burgages, assessment of, 122
- Burton Agnes, glebe arrangements in, 54
 — — as example of a 'three-field' manor, 58
 — — survival of the common-field system in, 147
 — — proportion of ploughs to ploughlands in, 156

BUR

Burton Agnes, size of carucata ad geldum in, 180

CAMBRIDGESHIRE, facsimiles of Domesday Book relating to, 670

'Cambridgeshire, Inquest of,' Exchequer Domesday for the county founded on, 486

— MS. of, in the British Museum, 488

Canterbury, Archbishopric of, continued tenure of lands of, 405

— status of the Archbishop of, 406

Canute, testimony of his laws as to number of churches, 434

'Car,' proportion of to 'hide,' 579

Carew's MSS., 263, 281, 373

Cartae Antiquae at H.M. Record Office, 636

Caruca, a term of assessment, 15

— 'terra ad,' 309 *et seq.*

— different sizes of, 566, 567

Carucae, tillage area calculated from number of, 149

— size of, dependent on strength of plough, 322

— adjutrices, 322

Carucata ad geldum, signification of, 157, 320

— — — area of, 164

Carucate, ungeldable land measured by the, 105

— the fiscal area, 149

— geldable and arable compared, 158-203

— area of, in two-field and three-field shifts compared, 159, 166

— — in the Boldon Book, 161

— — in monastic charters, 162

— Danish introduction of the, 199

— Norman re-introduction of the, 200

— its relation to the French divisions of the pound, 232

Cassel, 282

Castles, Norman, earthworks serving as, 394

Chalcos, 570

COM

Chamberlain's chest, the, probable identification of, 531

Charters, Anglo-Saxon, elucidation of Domesday by, 497

Chaucer, status of presbyters shown by, 441

Cheshire, Domesday works on, 510, 671

Chester, manors of the See of, 416

— 'Customs' of the Bishop of, 418

Chichester, manorial holdings of See of, 429

Chingford, early reference to Domesday in record of, 539

'Church, the, in Domesday, with especial reference to Episcopal Endowments,' by James Parker, M.A., 399-432

Church, the, its exemption from the payment of Danegeld, 83, 92

— — large amount of land held by, 399

Churches, scarcity of, in Domesday, 56, 433, 439

— classification of, in laws of Canute, 434

— Saxon, unmentioned in Domesday, 437

— sub-tenancy of, 442

— held by laymen, 445

Clarke, Hyde, V.P.R. Hist. S., Preface to 'Domesday Studies,' vii.

— — 'on the Turkish Survey of Hungary and its relation to Domesday Book,' 37-46

— — 'Note on the Order of Domesday Book,' 387-397

Clehangar, gift of manor of, 472, 476

— confirmation of grant of, 482

Code, Gwentian, 275

— Venedotian, 279

Colchester, collective liability as shown at, 129

— acres of meadow-land at, 218

Commissioners, Domesday, their judicial powers, 540, 548

Common fields, their exemption from taxation, 610, 612

COM

- Common-field tillage implied in Domesday, 147
 — — — proportion of plough-land to ploughs in, 156
 — — — small evidence of, in Anglo-Saxon charters, 498
 Cornwall, peculiar geld-measurement in, 216
 — facsimiles of Domesday books relating to, 672
 Coronations held at Winchester, 522
 'Corrody,' 54
 Cottenham Common, 347
 Council of the West, Puritan opposition to the, 535
 Counties, separate, Domesday works on, 510-13
 — facsimiles in Brit. Mus. of Surveys of, 659-95
 — Domesday as reference to boundaries of, 536
 Counting, duodecimal, among the Angli, 33, 317, 351
 Coutances, Geoffrey, Bp. of, English manors held by, 402
 — — presides over the Gemot at Penenden Heath, 429
 — — *placitum* in Worcestershire held by, 542
 Crawford and Balcarres, Lord, on the grouping of the Norman invaders of England, 389
 Cunningham acre, the, 286, 372
 Cymwd, 279

 'DANEGELD and the Finance of Domesday,' by J. Horace Round, M.A., 77-142
 Danegeld, its Saxon assessment-levy per hide, 12
 — tributary and stipendiary, 79
 — the great levy of in 1083-4, 82
 — exemption of the Church from, 83, 96
 — amount of, in Pipe-Roll of 1130, 85
 — how raised, 89

DOM

- Danegeld, special exemptions from, 98-104
 — reduction of, in four southern counties, 110
 Danes, the carucate introduced by the, 199
 'Days' maths,' meadow land measured by, 219
 Decunx, 617
 Denarius, 233, 236 *et seq.*
 — the, varying weights of, 236, 578
 Derman of London, identification of, 558
 Dessatina, Russian, 562
 Dialect, identification of place-names by means of, 450
Dialogus de Scaccario, as to the meaning of 'Domesday,' 4
 — — — as to the levy of Danegeld, 85
 — — — evidence of, as to the Westminster Exchequer, 524, 526, 528
 — — — authorship of, 534
 — — — at H.M. Public Record Office, 631
 'Domesday Book, Bibliography of,' edited by H. B. Wheatley, F.S.A., 663-695
 'Domesday Book, on the Study of,' by Stuart Moore, F.S.A., 1-28
 'Domesday Book, on the Turkish Survey of Hungary and its relation to,' by Hyde Clarke, V.P.R. Hist. S., 37-46
 'Domesday Book, the materials for the re-editing of, and suggestions for the formation of a Domesday Book Society,' by W. de G. Birch, F.S.A., 485-515
 'Domesday Book, the official custody of,' by Hubert Hall, F.S.A., F.R. Hist. S., 517-537
 'Domesday, an early Reference to,' by J. Horace Round, M.A., 539-559
 'Domesday Survivals,' by Canon Isaac Taylor, M.A., LL.D., Litt. D., 47-66

DOM

- Domesday, various interpretations of name, 4
- known as *Rotulus Wintonie* in time of John, 6
- its object assessment, not measurement, 11
- considered as rate book, 19
- social life illustrated by, 21
- its practical uses, 24
- recognition of common pasturage in, 39, 50
- omission of certain counties, 48
- land tenure in, 52
- wapentakes and hundreds in, 68
- 'inlands' in, 107
- seigneurial and crown dues in, 132
- gablum, or gafol, in, 133
- two-field and three-field manors in, 145
- common-field tillage implied in, 147
- measures of land in, 189 *et seq.*
- geldable hide of, 319, 326, 346
- order of, 387
- language of, 389
- the Church in, 399 *et seq.*
- omission of churches in, 433, 437
- its evidence as to population, 454
- an alleged inaccuracy of, 471
- points inquired into for compilation of, 494
- omission of four northern counties from, 494
- its authority as a Record, 532, 535
- Commissioners, judicial powers of, 540, 548
- preservation of original returns for, 547
- 'Descriptio Angliæ,' 552
- *inter ripam* in, 246, 302, 577
- Domesday Book, where kept, 491
- — date of, 492
- — where originally kept, 518
- — kept with the King's seal, 530
- its removal to the Public Record Office, 531

EVR

- Domesday Book, description of, 623
- — Abbreviatio of, 628
- — Breviate of, 630
- Domesday Book Society, proposed formation of a, 486
- Domesday chest, 627
- covers, the old, 627
- Dominium*, the King's, rent from, 136
- Dorchester, removal of the See of, 411, 413, 438
- Dorsetshire, Domesday works on, 511
- — facsimiles of, 675
- Drachma, Attic and Eubœan, 582, 587, 602-607
- varying divisions of the, 602
- Drawings, contemporary, elucidation of Domesday by, 499, 568
- Duodecimal system among the Angli, 29, 33, 317, 351
- — Bede's evidence as to the, 615
- Durham, manors belonging to the See of, 419
- devastation of the province of, by William, 495
- Dynval, his land measurements, 275, 298, 373, 580

- ECCLESIOIÆ, mentions of, 439
- Edward the Confessor, cessation of 'stipendiary Danegeld' under, 81
- — — increase of churches under, 434
- Ell, land measurement by the 'old English,' 276
- cloth ells, list of, 367 *et seq.*
- — varying lengths of Royal, Egyptian, statute, 562
- Ely MS., its silence respecting churches, 444
- Erasure, method of, 325
- Erw, or Welsh acre, 266, 276, 279, 294, 298, 301
- as unit of British measurement, 298
- Evreux, English manors granted to Bishop of, 404

EXC

- Exchequer, what denoted by, 519
 — elaboration of, at Westminster, 523
 — re-establishment of, by Henry II., 525
 — Red Book of the, 631
 — Black Book of the, 633
 — smaller Black Book of the, 634
 — tallies of the, 635
 Exeter, special privilege of, as to Danegeld, 119
 — manors belonging to the See of, 424
 — Domesday, particulars of, 490
 Eyton, Mr., on exemptions from Danegeld, 92
 — — on the carucate, 105
 — — on the area of the hide, 194, 213
 — — on the judicial powers of the *Legati*, 540 *note*

- FALLOW-LAND, common, its exemption from taxation, 348 *et seq.*, 612
 Familia of Bede, 324
 Farmer, origin of term, 52
 Fen country, land holdings in the, 222
 Fertach, 264
 Ferthing, the Cornish, 278
 'Fields,' village, in Domesday, 57
 — survival of names of, 146
 Fire of London, removal of records during the, 531
Firmarius, a, monastic manors held by, 135
 Flambard, story of his proposed revision of the Survey, 116
 — his extortion from levied soldiers, 121
 Fleta, proportion of acres to carucates as given by, 17, 158, 162, 165, 349
 Foot, Anglo-Saxon, 255, 257
 — various measurements of the, 257, 275, 290, 364 *et seq.*
 — Scotch, 259, 270

GWE

- Foot, Babylonish, 270
 — list of, and remarks, 289, 364
 — Dynval's, 290, 303, 275
 — — 'pace,' 374-375
 — table of multiples, 375
 — not really a human, 378, 562
 Forrack, 264
Francigenae, post-conquest exemption of, from the Geld, 124
 Freeman, Prof. E. A., on the levy of Danegeld, 86
 — — on the powers of the Domesday Commissioners, 540
 Fyrd, or military service, town liability to, 120
- GABLUM, or gafol, signification of, 133
 — payment of, 134
 — fines for non-payment of, 139
 — later forms of, 140
 Gád, or goad, as measure, 276, 287, 288
 Gavael, value of, 279, 580
 Gavel-pennies, payment of, at Leicester, 140
 Geld, diversion of, to ecclesiastical quarters, 126
 — and hide, numerical relation between, 212
 'Geldable Unit of Assessment of Domesday, summary of a new view of the,' by O. C. Pell, 561-619
 Glebe as land tithe, 54
 Gloucester, compilation of Domesday determined on at, 493
 Gloucestershire, list of facsimiles of Survey of, 677
 Goizenboded, William, his detention of property in Gloucestershire, 557
 Grain, the, varying weights of, 233, 235, 572
 — not really vegetable, 573
 Grazing ground, common, survival of, 57
 Gwentian, or Venedotian, code, 298, 373

HAL

- HALL, HUBERT, F.S.A., F.R. Hist. S., on 'The Official Custody of Domesday Book,' 517-537
- Hamilton, Mr. N. E. S. A., the 'Inquest of Cambridgeshire' published by, 486
- Hampshire, destruction of churches in, 435
- Handwriting of Domesday, 492
- Hardy, Sir Thomas Duffus, on Domesday, 26
- Headlands, origin of, 63
- Heming's Cartulary, contemporary evidence as to the Survey in, 542
- abbreviation in, of Worcester Church possessions, 545
- Henry of Huntingdon quoted as to extent of hide, 193
- Hereford, French burgesses of, their exemption from Geld, 125
- manors of the See of, 418
- list of facsimiles of Survey of, 679
- Hide, definition of, 12, 323
- a term of assessment, 13-15
- 'hid mæl et æcer mæl,' 613
- 'extra hidam,' 346, 349, 613
- area of, 171, 211, 271, 274, 302, 313, 314, 326 *et seq.*, 351 *et seq.*
- allotments into, 252, 323
- as pound-paying unit, 300
- the areal, or *terra ad carucam*, 319
- its equivalence to the carucate, 323-327
- the geldable, 320-326 *et seq.*, 340, 346 *et seq.*, 612
- as term of measurement, 552
- its relation to the hundred, 118
- military assessment with reference to the, 120
- Holderness, equal proportion of ploughs to carucates in, 149, 166
- physical features of, 153
- Hugia*, or *huchia*, 521
- Hundred, the, historical significance of, 69
- fiscal unit for levy of Danegeld, 117
- Hundred Rolls, 363

KEN

- Hundreds, their gradual change to wapentakes, 68
- of Surrey, past and present, 462
- 'Hungary, on the Turkish Survey of, and its relation to Domesday Book,' by Hyde Clarke, V.P.R. Hist. S., 37-46
- Huntingdon, Henry of, on the preservation of the original Survey returns, 547
- Huntingdonshire, list of facsimiles of Survey of, 680
- INA's ransom, 342
- India, minuteness of weight divisions in, 572
- Ingulphus as to payments to churches by William II., 436
- 'Inland,' signification of, 107, 109
- Inquisitio Comitatus Cantabrigiensis*, 252, 486
- Inquisitio Eliensis*, 7
- acreage of hides in, 13
- its scope, 488
- Inquisitions, separate, Domesday compiled from, 492
- Inter ripam*, 'valets,' 246, 302
- explanation of, 577-9
- weights used, 603
- Ireland, town lands in, 251
- length of perch in, 282
- JAPAN, relation of Cunningham acre to foot of, 286, 372
- relation of Cunningham acre to inc of, 379
- Jugerum, extent of, 562
- Justices, itinerant, their functions, 548
- KEMBLE, on the extent of the hide, 210
- Kensington, Domesday entry of, 217
- Kent, fragment of Survey for, in Brit. Mus., 496
- list of facsimiles of Survey of, 680

KIN

Kind, payments in, 234
 King's seal kept with Domesday Book, 530
 Kinley, restoration of Priory of, to the Benedictines, 478
 Kirby's Quest, 641

'LAND, Notes on Domesday Measures of,' by J. Horace Round, M.A., 189-225

— transfer of, 27
 — in cultivation under-estimated, 615
 — tenure of, in Asia, 40
 — — — Domesday, 52
 — — — unusual form of, 556
 — divisions of the, 250 *et seq.*, 561
 — ecclesiastical, large amount of, 399
 — — stability of possession of, 405
 — occasional independent tenure of, by monks, 443
 — fallow, its exemption from taxation, 610
 — divisions of, coincide with those of pound, 297 *et seq.*, 570, 580
 — Anglo-Saxon, 259

Lanes, their course determined by Domesday tillage, 63

Lanfranc, his accession to the Archbishopric of Canterbury, 405

— his recovery of Kentish lands from Odo, 496

Latin, Norman use of, in administration, 389

Leap, 275

Legati, Mr. Eyton on the judicial powers of the, 540 *note*

'Leicester Inquests, the True Story of,' 140

Leicestershire, identity of hundreds and wapentakes in, 74

— list of facsimiles of Survey of, 682

Leuga, acreage of the, 252

— Anglican, 253, 256, 271 *errata*

Liability, collective, Anglo-Saxon principle of, 129

Liber niger of Hexham, acreage of holdings in, 162

MAN

Liber niger of Peterborough, payment in kind as shown by, 53

— — — different systems of land measurement in, 196

— Wintoniensis, 522

Libra, see 'Pound' and 'Weight'

— modes of division of, 32, 33

— division of into shillings and pence, 229

— division corresponding to that of land, 304 *et seq.*, 311 *et seq.*, 577

— Fleta's *libra mercatoria*, 582, 583

— Roman divisions of, 239

Lichfield, Bishop of, manors held by the, 416

Limesi, connection of the house of, with that of Rollo, 392

— — — connection with Tancarville, 389

Lincoln, Bishop of, land held by the, 410

— transfer of the Bishop's 'stool' to, 411, 438

Lincolnshire, episcopal lands in, 427

— list of facsimiles of Survey of, 682

Lisieux, English manors granted to the Bishop of, 403

Llathen Gyvelin, 276, 288

'Local Elucidation of the Domesday Survey, The Scope of,' by Frederick E. Sawyer, F.S.A., 447-457

London, Bishop of, lands held by the, 415

Long hundred, Anglo-Saxon practice of counting by, 34, 240, 317, 351

MAENOL, Welsh pound-paying unit of measurement, 276, 279, 280, 299, 301, 580

Malden, H. E., M.A., F.R. Hist. S., on 'The Domesday Survey of Surrey,' 459, 470

Manorial rights, Domesday evidence decisive as to, 24

Manors in Cambridgeshire and Yorkshire, 250, 251

Mansio of the Angli and Franks, 312

MAN

- Manuscripts &c. exhibited (1886) at H.M. Public Record Office, notes on, 621-647
 — exhibited (1886) at the British Museum, 651-657
 Marcey, Ralph de, his aggressions on the lands of the chapter of St. Paul's, 553
 — William de, his compromise with the canons, 554
 Mark, Mercian, value of, 233, 239, 578
 — Attic, weight of, 607
 Market dues, payment of, 136
 Meadow land, 'acre' as applied to, 218, 219
 Measurements, duodecimal, 240, 264, 563
 — sexdecimal, 249, 570
 — Dynval's, 275, 298, 373, 580
 'Measures of Land, Notes on Domesday,' by J. Horace Round, M.A., 189-225
 Mercian marks, 233, 242-246
 — pence, 245
 — ora, or solidus, 247, 578, see 'Ora,' *post*
 Mile, Dynval's, 275
 Military tenure as systematised by Domesday, 24
 Millers, how paid, 53
 Mina, 570
 — Italian, 597
 — Roman, 597
 Monasteries, land held by, 399
 — Norman, English manors held by, 431
 Monks, independent tenure of land by, 443
 Moore, Stuart, F.S.A., on 'The Study of Domesday Book,' 1-28
 Morgen, meaping of, 370
- NAMES, tribal, reconstructed from place names, 451
 New Forest, destruction of churches in forming the, 435

OPE

- 'New View, A, of the Geldable Unit of Assessment of Domesday,' by O. C. Pell, M.A., 227-363
 Norfolk, list of facsimiles of Survey of, 684
 Normandy, landowners of, their relation to Domesday, 387
 — English land held by Bishops of, 401, 403, 431
 Normans, limitation of their immigration, 391
 — their influence on English population, 392
 — grouping of the, in England, 395
 Norwich, See of, removed from Thetford, 412
 Nottingham Records, 'the two boroughs' in the, 126
 Nottinghamshire, identity of hundreds and wapentakes in, 74
 — list of facsimiles of Survey of, 685
 Numeration, Anglo-Saxon, 259, 296, 317 *et seq.*, 350 *et seq.*, 612-4
 — — x. means xii., 613, 617
 — — case of Shelford, 34, 357, 617
 — — practical working of, 360, 610, 612
 — — ready reckoner founded on, 360
 — — cases of Wilburton and Stretton, 614-615
 — — Bede's tables, 615 *et seq.*
 Nummus, weight of the, 236
 Nympsfield, examination as to gift of, 471
 — retention of, by the Berkeley family, 475
 — Abbot Serlo's claim to, 476
- OBOLUS, 570
 Odo, Bishop of Bayeux, English manors held by, 401
 — his unwarranted possession of land and dues, 468
 Old Sarum, no church mentioned at, in the Survey, 438
 'Open field' system, 147, 220, 222, 311

ORA

- Ora of sixteen pence, 234, 239, 241, 238, 563, see 'Mercian,' *ante*
 'Order of Domesday Book, Note on the,' by Hyde Clarke, V. P. R. Hist. S., 387-397
 Oswaldslawe, survey of the Episcopal Liberty of, 546
 Otho the Goldsmith, his wrongful detention of lands, 555
 Ounce, see 'Ora,' 239
 — proportion of, to talent, 374
 Oxen, number of, to a plough, 51, 209
 Ox gangs, curved divisions of, 60 *et seq.*, 270
- PALMER, Mr., on meadow-land acres, 219
 Pared, 276
 'Parish Churches omitted in the Survey—The Presbyter,' by Herbert J. Reid, F.S.A., 433-446
 Parker, James, M.A., on 'The Church in Domesday, with especial reference to Episcopal Endowments,' 399-432
 Pasturage, common, antiquity of, 39
 Pasture land, common, not taxed, 349
 Payment in kind, 53
 Pell, O. C., M.A., on various areal measurements of virgates, 29
 — on Canon Taylor's view of the carucate, 186
 — 'A New View of the Geldable Unit of Assessment of Domesday,' 227-363
 — 'Summary of a New View of the Geldable Unit of Assessment of Domesday,' 561-619
 Penenden Heath, Gemots held at, 428
 — record of the suit concerning, 496
 — *placitum* concerning, 544
 Penny sterling, weight of, 233
 — various weights of, 237
 — Mercian and Norman, 247, 572
 Pevensey, instances of 'gablum' in, 136

PRE

- Phear, Sir J. B., on the object of the Domesday Survey, 35
 Philip, King, his *Registrum*, 387
 Pipe-Rolls, mention of Danegeld in the, 85
 — evidence of, as to Winchester Treasury, 519, 524, 527
 — destruction of, in Stephen's reign, 524
 — notice of, as to Treasury at Westminster, 527
 — exhibited (1886) at H.M. Public Record Office, 634
 Place names, importance of, 448
 — influence of physical features on, 453
 Plough-lands, curved outline of, 60, 64, 294
 — proportion of ploughs to, in Yorkshire, 149
 — acreage of, 192-208
 'Plough-land, The, and the Plough,' by Canon Isaac Taylor, M.A., LL.D., Litt. D., 143-188
 Ploughing, Anglo-Saxon drawings of, 499
 Population, local, past and present, 51
 — deductions from Domesday as to, 361, 363, 454
 — distribution of servile and semi-free, in Surrey, 469
 Pound, the, Anglo-Saxon division of, 230
 — Norman, in weight of wheat grains, 233
 — Troy, its relation to avoirdupois, 241
 — division of, in relation to land, 249
 — relation of, to the leuga, 259
 — — acre, 300
 — land measurements as governed by, 301
 — Roman, various divisions of, 596
 — Troy and Tower, 602-607
 Preaching crosses as substitutes for churches, 56

PRE

- Presbyter, signification of, in the Survey, 433, 440
 Priest, payment of, by land produce, 54
 QUARANTENA, or stadium, acreage of, 252, 257, 258, 291
 — tables of, 381 *et seq.*
 — its association with the lineal acre, 220
 RADULPHUS DE LIMESI, lands held by, 392
 Ramsey Chartulary, variable acreage of hides in, 13
 — — variable acreage of virgates, 18
 — — land *extra hidam* in, 17
 — — abstract of King Eadgar's charter to the Abbey of, 645
 Randiv, 276, 279, 580
 Ready reckoner, 360
 Regalia, when deposited in the Treasury at Westminster, 530
Registrum Munimentorum in the Record Office, 642
 Reid, Herbert J., F.S.A., on 'Parish churches omitted in the Survey. The Presbyter,' 433-446
 Religious foundations returned as *tenentes in capite*, 430
 Remigius, Bishop of Lincoln, on the Survey Commission, 411
 Rents, Domesday payment of, 52
 Ridge, 375
 Rights of way, survival of, 63
 Rochester, manors held by the Bishop of, 427
 Rod, or virga, variations in length of, 210
 — scale of, 25 *et seq.*, 286, 291, 303, 305-311, 375
 — divisions of, 287
 — Dynval's, 276
 Romans, their divisions of the libra, 229
 Round, J. Horace, M.A., on 'Dane-geld and the Finance of Domesday,' 77-142

SOL

- Round, J. Horace, 'Notes on Domesday Measurements of Land,' 189-225
 — 'An early Reference to Domesday,' 539-559
 — on the meaning of *manens*, 483
 'Run-rig,' system of, still visible, 59
 ST. PAUL's, reference to Domesday in MSS. of the Dean and Chapter of, 539
 St. Peter's, Gloucester, History of the Monastery of, quoted, 471
 — — connection of, with Nympsfield, 477
 Salisbury, manors belonging to the See of, 426
 Sawyer, Frederick E., F.S.A., on 'The Scope of Local Elucidation of the Domesday Survey,' 447-457
Scaccario, *Dialogus de*, in the Record Office, 631
 Seeböhm, Mr., his identification of the hide with the plough-land, 193
 — on the ox-team for a caruca, 209
 — on land-holdings in the Fen country, 222
 Seisrichs, 251
 Selden quoted as to number of churches in Survey, 436
 Serlo, Abbot, his claim to Nympsfield, 473 *et seq.*
 Servus, land tenable by the, 362
 Sexacra, 359
 Sextula, reduction by the, in land measurements, 612, 616, 618
 Shilling, or solidus, various forms of, 238
 — Anglo-Saxon, 568
 Ship-money levied on the wapentake, 76
 Shrewsbury, exaction of full Geld from diminished number of burgesses at, 122
 Siliqua, Roman, 572
 Smiths in Domesday England and modern Turkey, 46
 Solidus, 238

SOL

- Solin, or suling, Kentish unit of Survey Assessment, 160, 195, 349
 — how entered in Survey, 201
 Solon, weight of talent of, 571, 581
 Southampton, instances of 'gablum' in, 136
 Spans, table of, 289-90
 Stadialis Ager, 371
 Stadium, see 'Quarantena'
 Stafford, division of the burgage rents of, 214
 Staffordshire, list of facsimiles of Survey of, 688
 Stangell, 290
 Stiffness of soil no guide to size of holding, 295
 Stubbs, Dr., as to imposition of Dane-geld, 80, 86
 Sub-tenants in England and Scotland, definition of, 391
 — English, continuance of, in Surrey under William, 467
 'Surrey, the Domesday Survey of,' by H. E. Malden, M.A., F.R. Hist. S., 459-70
 — deviation from the Survey of boundaries of, 460
 — present hundreds not coincident with those of Survey, 462
 — paucity of English tenants in chief in, 466
 — list of facsimiles of Survey of, 690
 Survey of England, Saxon, of the eighth century, 499
 Sussex, place-names in, 450, 452
 — list of facsimiles of Survey of, 691

TALENT, various weights of the, 570-602

- Tallies of the Exchequer, 635
 Tathes, Irish, acreage of, 283
 Taxation, the Survey as guide to, 444
 — Pope Nicholas's, 640
 Taylor, Canon Isaac, M.A., LL.D., Litt. D., 'Domesday Survivals,' 47-66

VAL

- Taylor, Canon Isaac, 'Wapentakes and Hundreds,' 67-76
 — 'The Plough-land and the Plough,' 143-188
 — on the carucates of two- and three-field manors, 204, 210
 Team, the, taken as basis of assessment, 11, 14
 Tenants in chief, order of entry of, 389
 — — — Bishops holding manors as, 409
 — — — religious foundations returned as, 430
 — — — English, in Surrey, 467
 'Testa de Nevill,' 640
Terra unius carucæ, as areal hide, 201, 319
Theloneum, or market dues, 137, 138
 Thetford, episcopal manors of, 410, 414
 Thraves, payment of the priest by, 54
 Thrimsa, 245
 Tircumhall, measurement of, in Brehon laws, 264, 562
 Tithes, Domesday disposal of, 43
 Treasure, removals of, 531
 Treasury, retention of the, at Winchester, 519
 Trees, proprietorship of, 39
 Trev, 276, 279
 Troy grain, weight of, 235
 — weights, their Eastern connection, 236
 — talent, 571
 Two-field and three-field systems of agriculture, 145, 611
 Tydden, 279, 580

UNIT OF ASSESSMENT, Welsh pound-paying, 301

- — — English pound-paying, 327
 Unitas, what it means, 615

VAKUF property in Turkey, 44
Valor Ecclesiasticus, 643

VAL

- Valoynes, Peter de, his seizure of chapter land, 539
- his death-bed restitution, 549
- Roger de, retains the land, 550
- Vambéry, Armin, on Turkish registers in Hungary, 37
- Venedotian Code, as to measurements of the erw, 275
- division of the pound in, 580
- Village community, land-divisions of, 221
- Villanus* and *servus*, meaning of, 360-363
- Virgates, proportion of, to hides, 13, 194
- variations of, 18, 258, 295, 308 *et seq.*, 315 *et seq.*, 347
- Virga, or rod, varying measurements of, 287, 291, 303, 305, 311, 561
- Dynval's, 276

WALES, land measurements in, 266

- South, land measurement in, 275
- North, land measurement in, 279
- rod of, 312

Wallingford, gablum of estates in, 137

Waltham Abbey, quotation as to Domesday from Register of, 5

- 'Wapentakes and Hundreds,' by Canon Isaac Taylor, M.A., LL.D., Litt. D., 67-76
- non-equivalence of, 67
- in the Danish shires, 70

Wara, extent of freedom of, from taxation, 260, 348, 611

— taxation of appropriated pieces of, 346

— ready reckoner as to, 360

— signification of, 610

— Wynston Manor, 611

'Waste,' use of term in Survey, 124, 131

Waters, Mr., on the extent of a 'hide,' 192

Wealden clay, former uninhabited condition of, 460

WOL

Webb, Mr. Carteret, on Danegeld, 77

Weights, Roman, 229, 591, 595

— Anglo-Saxon, 230, 583, 588

— Troy, 230, 588, 603, 606, 607

— Mercian, or *inter ripam*, 233, 234, 237, 239 *et seq.*, 247, 563, 577, 589, 603

— Ethelred's, 234, 241, 246

— Irish, 240

— Avoirdupois, 241

— ancient and modern, identity of, 569 *et seq.*

— Solon's, 571

— Tower, 583, 603-7

— Apothecaries', 588

— the hundredweight, 591, 593

— Teake's division of, 592

Wells, episcopal manors of, 429

Weregilds, amounts of, 243

Westminster, removal of the Exchequer to, 519, 526

— foundation charter of St. Peter's Monastery at, 637

Wheat corns, weight of, 572

Wheatley, H. B., F.S.A., Editor of 'Bibliography of Domesday Book,' 663-695

William I., his aims in the Domesday Survey, 10

— reorganisation of government by, 25

— levy of Danegeld under, 80, 87

— devastation under, 131

— his respect for Church endowments, 399, 432

William of Malmesbury as to the raising of Danegeld, 84

Winchester, manors held by Bishop of, 421

— Exchequer held at, 519, 527

— Treasury retained at, 519, 527

— Domesday probably kept at, 522

Winston, Court Rolls of, quoted as to wara, 611

Wolds, Yorkshire, proportion of carucates to ploughs in, 149

WOL

- Wolds, Yorkshire, three-field townships in, 171
 Worcester, episcopal manors of, 415
 — survey of Church possessions in, 545
 Worcestershire, list of facsimiles of Survey of, 694
 Wrottesley, General, on a convention recorded in the Burton cartulary, 548

YOR

- XENOPHON, weight of *siglus* according to, 595
 YORK, manors held by the Archbishop of, 407
 Yorkshire, relation of wapentakes and hundreds in the Ridings of, 68, 71
 — survival of archaic conditions in the East Riding of, 143
 — list of facsimiles of Survey of, 695

